THE

AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW.

Bonum est homini ut eum veritas vincat volentem, quia malum est homini ut eum veritas vincat invitum. Nam ipsa vincat necesse est, sive negantem sive confitentem.
S. AUG. EPIST. CCXXXVIII. AD PASCENT.

VOLUME XIV.

FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER, 1889.

PHILADELPHIA:
HARDY & MAHONY,
PUBLISHERS AND PROPRIETORS,
505 CHESTNUT STREET.

COPYRIGHT, 1889,

BY

HARDY & MAHONY.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL. XIV.—JULY, 1889.—No. 55.

CATHOLICITY AND HUMAN RIGHTS.

WE will not say that it is strange how some men think, speak, and write as they do about the Catholic Church, as if she were an institution founded in usurpation, upheld by despotism, and opposed in principle and in act to human liberty and right, despite her constant denial of the charge and counter-complaint of being herself the persecuted one and the victim of foul play. We have lived long enough to learn that in all family quarrels each side makes the most of its wrongs, real or fancied.

Certainly the Catholic Church is much complained of, but she has her complaint as well, and she makes it. Such of the world who oppose her say to her in no measured tones of indignation: "You fetter our liberties in thought, word, and deed, or where you do not it is the happy result for us of lack of opportunity, not of will. You deny to our fellow-men, who are blind enough to believe in you, their rights as men and women, as citizens and Christians. You stand in the way of progress. You are by nature a spiritual despot, and when you obtain sway are a social and political one, too. We cannot live at peace with you, and we are convinced that it is for the good of mankind to get rid of you as soon as possible."

To half-educated, self-conceited, clap-trap orators and essayists of the Ingersollian type, she is a profound enigma both in existence and doctrine. Unwilling to acknowledge anything to be beyond their ken, either in the heavens above or in the earth be-

neath or in the waters under the earth, and not daring, because consciously unable, to meet her face to face with logical argument, they dismiss both her and her pretensions with a contemptuous wave of the hand, or pile epithet upon epithet to denounce her as a dangerous enemy to mankind, specially to that "enlightened" portion of the race they now have the honor to address. Ill-concealed, uneasy jealousy of her intellectual superiority and open hate of her exalted moral purity, find a very just expression of their convictions in the sentence that "the only reformation of which she is capable is destruction."[1]

To all this the Church calmly replies: "You, who thus speak, know neither me nor my children whom I put into possession of superior rights and higher privileges than any you are able to claim or enjoy. You persecute me without cause. You deny me and mine the liberty you claim for yourselves. Your complaints are calumnies; for I am no tyrant, but the very teacher and mistress of liberty. Banish me, achieve your reformation of me by destruction, and progress in what is worthy would be impossible. I am the prophet, priest, and judge of all right, social, political, and religious." Here is, to say the least, a very serious human family misunderstanding. We propose to do a little more than give an "honest opinion" thereon, which would appear to be the highest evolution of human thought possible in the eyes of the Church's adversaries,—we propose to get at the truth.

We begin with the first of all facts, the reason of all things, the source of all right, the last appeal in all dispute, the solution of all questions—God. He who would investigate the nature, life, aspirations, claims, or destiny of man without reference to God, must first prove that without God he is man. If man can lay claim to any prerogative as a right; if any goal of ambition is open to him; if, face to face with his fellow-man, he may exact compliance with his own will, or refuse his obedience to the will of another, such claim is valid, such ambition is lawful, such rights of equality or superiority are just only because they are, at last account, the rights and prerogatives of God Himself in His own creation, to be exercised for His sake, and to be enjoyed by Him in pursuance of the end which can alone justify the existence of man at all. The rights of man are therefore divine in origin, as are also the institutions of the family, society, state, and church through which they are transmitted. As origin of all that is, God is not only first but final cause. This latter attribute is one which the modern self-styled scientist finds it very convenient to ignore; and herein lies the only

[1] *The North American Review*, "Professor Huxley and Agnosticism." By Col. R. G. Ingersoll.

logical consistency of agnosticism. There is cause and effect; but they illogically deny that the *first effect* is correlative to the *first known*, which supposes a First Knower as First Cause. Their conception of cause rises no higher than what philosophers distinguish as impersonal and unknowing secondary causes. Even in intelligent causes the idea of final cause as involving purpose of action finds no exemplar in their so-named absolute cause, which consequently is as unknowing as it is unknowable.

But the common sense of mankind instinctively recognizes the truth of the Catholic philosophy of the creative act. Men acknowledge the Divine original source of their rights, and as well that God is the judge of their just enjoyment—at least when it subserves their own interest, as is shown in the fact that the Divine sanction has been universally invoked upon the ratification of the matrimonial, social, political, and religious compact, and that whenever they are deprived of the free and just exercise of their rights as claimed under any of these institutions, they appeal to God for defence and judgment.

The very idea of right, whether considered as an attribute of man as an intelligent and responsible being, or as affecting his relations with others of his kind, and with the inferior orders of created beings, is a divine idea, whose expression is correlative to and dependent upon the other ideas, equally divine, of authority and obedience for love.

Authority supposes an author, an origin, and man is the absolute author or origin of nothing. Neither could he originate the idea of authority. He must necessarily find it in the Divine manifestation made to his intelligence of the Divine *reason why* he is a creature of the Divine Author, as he must also deduce the ideas of the family, of society, of the state, and of the church, not alone from the simply observed facts of the existence of those institutions, but from the consideration of the divine intention or reason why of them. If their final purpose does not originate with man, he cannot claim the originality of having invented them; neither can he arrogate to himself anything more than a secondary instrumentality in their actual institution and perfection.

Lacking the manifestation of these divine ideas, his reason might recognize the facts of priority and power, from which he can deduce indeed the obedience of subjection or slavery, as universally found among nations among whom the memory of the original Divine intention became more or less obliterated, but never the obedience of love and the filial relation of man to God; nor that same relation, fitly characterized as filial, existing between supreme authority and the subject such as we have seen exhibited in former days by society and states, Catholic and Christian, based as they

were upon a full recognition of that manifestation of the Divine Will. In them we behold with admiration what pagan society never dreamed of, and what the revival of paganism in modern society is fast rendering a dream of the past; on the one hand strength and moderation in rule, with valorous loyalty combined with noble self-respecting freedom on the other.

Man may be said to have invented the *Imperium*, and may boast of it so far as it has any value towards the advancement of a true civilization of the race, but never authority. Obligation of service from the inferior in intelligence and strength he could invent, but not obedience from equals, and still less willing obedience to equals or inferiors from those superior to them.

We, who in this day are living under the beneficent influences (or what is left by demagogues or charlatans, social, political, and religious) of a civilization which is divine and not human; breathing the atmosphere of a society whose warmth and fruitfulness is wholly due to and dependent upon the divine spirit infused into the life and conditions of the family, civil society, government, and the Christian Church, are apt to take all this for granted as the result of what is gratuitously assumed to be the natural product of human progress; forgetting the lessons of history, which amply prove the vaunted progress of man, left to his own devices, to have always culminated in forms of civilization which, of themselves, tended to the exaltation of the sensual over the spiritual, to the aggrandizement of the Imperium at the expense of human liberty and divine right, to the alternation of a blind, self-destructive anarchy, with the basest and most degrading slavery. All the rights of which we boast, and which we so highly prize, are of divine origin, enjoyed as the fruit of a divine civilization, built incontestably upon the principles of authority and the obedience of love; an authority which was ever accepted as a reflex of the Divine Will, and a cheerful obedience of love, imitating the obedience of the one and only Regenerator, Redeemer, and Civilizer of men; an obedience of love culminating in the sacrifice of the cross, example of the highest wisdom of God, but to the Jews a stumbling-block, and to the Gentiles foolishness; and, we may add, to the agnostic, superstition.

Whatever may have been the original revelation made to the first parents of the race, it is plain that, so far as history gives evidence, mankind everywhere soon fell into a state which possessed but a very imperfect realization of what we would now deem to be a civilization of humanity worthy of the name. What we do know is, that God, so to speak, has accommodated the actual revelation of His Divine Will to the state to which mankind had either reduced or advanced itself by the unconstrained use of its free will. When we

see certain actual proclamations of the Divine Will made, as, for instance, through Moses and the prophets, and the most clear and perfect revelation of all made by our Lord, they seem to us as if made in advance of their age, or "before their time"; though, as we now see, particularly in the history of Catholicity, which is only a life development of the revelation made by Jesus Christ and its application to human affairs, all these manifestations were made just when God knew that mankind could and would receive them with profit. The development and enforcement of the Christian revelation by Catholicity amongst the nations exhibit precisely the same toleration of the actual state of mankind and recognition of man's free will, meanwhile teaching, inviting, persuading him into the paths of a higher civilization, which the Divine economy has always shown from the beginning of the world.

If man is seen at any time rising out of ignorance and barbarism, or struggling for a higher and purer elevation of his intellectual and moral nature, it is because God by some means is teaching him and revealing either directly or mediately glimpses of the divinely true, good and beautiful sufficiently clear to attract without compelling him, and thus leaving the order of merit intact.

Humanity civilizes itself through Divine instruction and by Divine invitation and help; but that man may justly receive the merit and enjoy its fruits, nothing can be plainer than that he is under the necessity of overcoming the proclivities of his nature, which, of themselves, lead him to the aggrandizement of power, self-indulgence of his baser appetites and consequent descent to a lower order of civilization. And this victory over himself cannot be accomplished without recognition of the Divine Will as the reason why of his submission to the efforts required of him, whether that Divine Will be expressed in the primal prohibition: "Thou shalt not eat of the tree of good and evil," in the ten commandments of Sinai, or in the completer definition of the moral law as made by the Catholic Church.

That which the fallen nature of Adam least of all desires, and against which it wages a perpetual and spiteful war, is precisely the civilization, the honor of whose triumphs philosophers of the rationalist school impudently ascribe to man as its creator, yet whose fundamental principles of life, and the only possible meritorious aid which man can give towards its successful achievement, they ignorantly denounce in the same breath as puerile, womanish, and absurd, the principles of self-denial and sacrifice.

Let them clamor as loudly as they may to the contrary, the civilization of modern society, or at least all of it which has refined and elevated the spiritual in man, is the civilization of the children of God, and not of the children of men; a civilization built upon obedience, self-denial, and the sacrifice of martyrs.

The principles of priority and power can give license to sensuality and refinement to vice, but the resulting civilization, so called, can produce, as history plainly shows, nothing better than the base nobility of wealth or of brute force on the one hand, and servitude, combined with a poverty that is esteemed despicable, on the other.

Until the light and liberty of a Divine civilization burst upon the world, and wherever man, swayed by his prevaricated nature, arrogated to himself the foundation and achievement of his own destiny, and assumed the prerogatives of creator and lord of the family, the state and the church, right and might were synonymous.

If Divine civilization succeeded in supplanting the vain and incompetent attempts of human civilization, it has done so by virtue of precisely the opposite principles assumed by the latter. It has overcome the world by suffering and sacrifice, by proclaiming the inscrutable logic of divine wisdom in the Gospel beatitudes—to human wisdom senseless paradoxes, and bestowing with her hands of benediction the possession of the earth as an inheritance upon the meek, and the kingdom of God upon the poor.

Egyptian, Grecian, and Roman civilizations, the highest and most powerful of all human forms of it, bore indeed within their gigantic frames the seeds of mortal disease, as all things human do since the day in which God declared the surety of death as a penalty for self-deification and self-indulgence; but the secret of their overthrow lay in the divinely irresistible power of the cross of Jesus Christ, who, as God, declared that when He should be uplifted upon it He would draw all things to Himself. Surely if ever human reason had a fair field to exhibit its power to elevate and refine mankind, and lay the foundation of an imperishable empire, one might expect to have seen its accomplishment in the bosom of those three great nations. The cultivation of the beautiful alone, in art, philosophy, and literature, and even in religion (for what could surpass the humanly beautiful in pagan mythology), reaching as it did amongst them an eminence of perfection never equalled, might appear to have justly warranted the hope of perpetual sovereignty in the intellectual, political, and religious world, and of itself to have been a sufficiently firm basis to ensure permanence of the order of civilization of which it was the fruit. So it might have been but for one thing—it manifested only a *human* reason why, the deification of human passion and pride; but we look in vain for any expression of the divine reason why.

The decadence and downfall of those nations is an enigma to all who cannot or will not see in it the finger of the hand of God, whose *Mane, Thekel, Phares* we to-day can read inscribed upon the

Egyptian obelisk standing before the portals of the temple of the divine reason why, rearing its majestic presence above the ruins of the city of imperial Rome, standing amid thousands of her broken triumphal arches and sculptured pillars lying prostrate before its walls, though far more perfect in their forms of beauty than its own—

Ecce Crucem Domini, fugite partes adversæ!

"Behold the cross of the Lord! Let all its adversaries be put to flight!"

Yet, again and again it must renew its victory as age succeeds age, and the proud heart of man rises in rebellion against the authority of God. Self-conceited philosophers and self-constituted leaders delude the people with cries of liberty and human rights; and having aroused the passions and greed of the multitude, and succeeded in disturbing the reigning order so laboriously established by self-sacrifice in the defense of truth, announce disorder, and call upon mankind to right the wrongs they themselves have created. Thence are inaugurated those bloody and nation-destroying revolutions, prepared by the denial of the Divine Authority in church and state, and the undermining of the very foundation stone of the social order—the institution of the family—by divorce and free love; and wrecking the political fabric by the propagation among the masses of anarchical principles, now called liberalism, now socialism, now communism, and already nihilism, the most impudent defiance of the Divine Authority ever dared since Lucifer uttered his "Non serviam!" against the Most High God.

In every instance their work has been, as it plainly must be, a work of destruction; and the foolish and guilty nations, appalled at the scene of carnage and ruin that has ever followed in the train of these apostles of error; reading the pages of the history of their own folly and misfortunes, blotted with tears and stained with blood; and feeling the tightening of the shackles of slavery which the triumph of error has imposed upon them, see too late the borders of the yawning abyss to which Satan, disguised as an angel of regeneration, has, with artful wiles, seduced them.

Loud and deep are now the curses heaped upon the heads of the would-be regenerators of the disturbed social order by the unhappy and disappointed people; and dreadful has been the vengeance wreaked upon them by their betrayed dupes. Furious and insensate is the wrath of these Satanic emissaries who perceive themselves baffled of their expected and, as they hoped, assured triumph over God. Our pen almost refuses to repeat the horrible blasphemies which they dare to pour forth from their raging lips. But let us listen to one; for as the traveller who, in the darkness of night, hears not far off the roar and crashing din of some hidden cataract

of angry waters as it plunges down through jagged rocks from a precipitous height to a swirling whirlpool in the abyss beneath, suddenly arrests his footsteps and dares no nearer approach lest he be instantly engulfed and hurled to certain death, so the perusal of the words of one who spoke as only man could speak under the dominion of a spiteful, disappointed demon, may cause many to stop and think whither men of a like spirit, albeit feebler imitators, are, in our own day, haling them on, under pretense of reforming and regenerating the social condition of the suffering masses.

Thus Proudhon: "Why adore this phantom of a Deity? And what does he require of us by that band of enthusiasts who, on all sides, persecute us with their sermons? God! I do not acknowledge any God. God is, moreover, nothing but pure mysticism. If you wish us to listen to you, commence by banishing this word from your discourse; because the experience of three thousand years teaches me that he who speaks to me of God would rob me of my liberty or my purse. How much do you owe me? How much do I owe you? This is my religion and my God. This I say: The first duty of an intelligent and free man is immediately to discard the idea of God both from his soul and his conscience; because God, if he exists, is essentially hostile to our nature, and we are in nothing dependent upon him. By what right could God say to me, 'Be thou holy even as I am holy'? Lying spirit! I would say to him in reply, 'thou imbecile God, thy sovereignty is already at an end, seek other victims among the brutes; I know that I am not, neither can I ever become, holy, and how canst thou be so if thou and I resemble each other? Eternal father, Jupiter or Jehovah, whatever thou wishest to be called, learn from me that men know thee. Thou art, thou wast, and thou wilt ever be the rival of Adam, the tyrant of Prometheus. The times are now changed, and we behold thee weakened and dethroned. So long as humanity lies prostrate before an altar, the slave of kings and priests, it will continue condemned. Withdraw from me, thou Jehovah, for henceforth, freed from fear of thee, and having attained true wisdom, I swear with uplifted hand to heaven that thou art only the tormentor of my reason and the spectre of my conscience!"[1]

Who does not hear with shudderings of soul in this language of hell the echo of the cry of the demons of the sepulchres cast out aforetime by the Saviour of men when they said to him: "What have we to do with Thee, Jesus, thou Son of God? Art Thou come hither to torment us before the time?"

---

[1] Proudhon, *System of Contradictions*, chap. viii.

What other explanation can be given of the rancorous attacks made upon the Catholic Church by those "friends of humanity" who set up the standard of liberty, equality and fraternity, and even prate of the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of man: terms which have ever been not only the watchwords of Catholicity, but with which she for centuries led the people on to a divine victory over tyrants and themselves; rescuing them from the slavery of barbarism and the enervating thraldom of a pagan civilization. The socialism of to-day, with all its guile, cannot hide its vindictive hatred of the Church; for it instinctively knows, like the demons of old, that the Son of God is passing by its editorial and forensic sepulchres in the person of that divine Church, His other self.

We cannot refrain from pursuing the parallel. If, at this critical moment, the Church, in the personal lives and language of its representatives, proves itself to be worthy to speak and act for Christ,—which God, of His infinite mercy, grant,—these modern spirits of revolt against Divine order, like their forerunners, will be only too glad to escape from the bodies they have possessed and transport themselves with their insensate fury into a herd of swine, a base refuge into which history shows us those arrogant spirits, foiled of their intention, have ever fled. Who dare deny it? When the presence of Catholicity and its word of truth have appeared, clothed in those forms of divine majesty, and withal of divine meekness, humility and sacrifice, have not all the doctrines of rebellion against the authority of God, all the anarchical cries of revolution slunk away to hide their impotent mutterings and gnashings of teeth among that debased multitude whose fittest appellation is "swinish"—whose god is their belly and whose glory is their shame?

One thing we know, that as man and all creation beside him is the spoken word of God, imaging the divine ideals of the possible in being and life, and bearing the likeness of that Incommunicable Word "by whom all things were made, and without whom was made nothing that was made"; so we also know that His word cannot return unto him void. But it must return to Him as the echo of His own voice, for "who," exclaims holy Job, "shall answer Him?" Without that word, the life of the world would be as death, and except that infallible and all-healing word of truth reveal itself to man for his light and guidance; and as a new language with which he can speak to God in his own tongue, in vain would man seek a solution to the enigma of his own existence. For, while the Divine Word is a two-edged sword, one edge of which, like the sharp scalpel of the surgeon, wounds only to heal, and the other, with irresistible force, severs the hydra heads of error from the heart and body which sustain them and give them life, the

weapon of the human word, if it be not fashioned after the pattern of the Divine Word, is essentially blunt and inefficacious, where not destructive, simply because it is man's own attempt to give and conserve life.

There cannot be two Gods and two creations equally true; and therefore the creative word of God is alone true, and man's word is false and absurd when he does not affirm what God has spoken.

This will be plainly seen if we take man at his own word. "Every man has a right," says he, "to his own opinion." No apothegm more universal or more heartily defended than this. What does it imply? Evidently the assertion of man's self sovereignty and *right* to be governed only by his own will, and to refuse any yoke whatsoever, even that of truth, without his consent.

Only thus can we explain the intense dislike shown for the doctrine of the divine intolerance of truth always and everywhere affirmed by Catholicity. But who dares dispute the doctrine that truth, by its very nature, must be intolerant and claim absolute supremacy? Or who ever was presumptuous enough to claim for man the power of *making* any truth whatsoever, in any order?

Yet, what happens when man is brought face to face with this uncompromising word? He instantly claims the *right* to doubt, to submit it to the test of what he is pleased to call science, for so he arrogantly designates what is not science, but only inquiry and investigation. The mere knowledge of facts observed in created material nature, in the operation of its laws and relation of its powers, he assumes to be science. But he is not slow to find out that the Knower must be greater than the thing Known, and the god of the so-called scientist becomes himself. How can truth be truth if he has not affirmed it? Who is this God, creator, infinite, and almighty that is spoken of?—he is the Unknowable and therefore no object of science, no end for the intelligence of man. No wonder such sophists are proud, self-sufficient and vain as the cock who fancied the sun rose to hear him crow!

No one can affirm a truth without an act of self-denial, that is, an act of abdication of his own supremacy, and an act of adoration and acknowledgment of the supremacy of truth, of God. The original sin of man is the condition which of itself seeks to be the origin, specially of truth, and also, as a consequence, of goodness and loveliness; in a word, the ambition of originality. "I desire," says man, "to be as God, knowing good and evil. I wish to be acknowledged as an author, an origin. Therefore I am not so desirous simply to discover truth for its own sake. What I desire is the honor of its discovery, unless I could, perchance, announce a truth which no man has ever announced or discovered; and best of

all, if I could proclaim one which is entirely due to *me;* then shall I indeed be as God, and adored as God. Therefore I exercise all my faculties in endeavoring to discover if that were possible, a truth that would deny what is now worshipped and obeyed by man as truth. If I could prove that twice two do not make four, but five (or that, at any rate, they may make five in the planet of Venus or elsewhere), or if I could prove the existence of God impossible; or that what are called facts are only illusions; that God could not give evidence enough to compel belief in a miracle; that there never was any miracle; that truth itself is not at all a divine but a human affirmation, and therefore science could abolish and reverse the whole present order of truth; ah! then I shall have the honor of creating a truth, of being the original author of such a proposition. Truth would not then be my supreme master and exact my homage, willing or unwilling; but this new truth must pay me homage, and all men must ascribe supremacy to me, to my original mind, and bow down before the majesty of my intellect."

Why do men propose such absurd dicta for the whole world to believe on their affirmation—men who are, by profession, philosophers? What can possibly induce them to do this? Plainly because they are resolved to rebel against the supremacy of truth which they instinctively know and feel is not *from them*, and seek to establish their own supremacy on what *stands for truth.* But outside of truth is only the absurd. "Well, then," the proud heart of man replies, "let God be the God of truth, I will be the god of absurdity. I plainly see that if I seek for truth as truth, I am only helping to confirm the greater glory and supremacy of the Divine Author, and forcing myself to make a constant act of self-abdication and submission to His *authority.* I can create the absurd. What matter so long as I am creator, king, lord of something, even that be a nothing to God!"

The only explanation of that singular taste for, and keen enjoyment of, the absurd shown by the human mind is sin, the original sin, the satanic spirit, the sin of pride, of self-worship, or self love, of self-glorification. Man delights in the affirmation and expression of the absurd because it is his own *quasi* creation, the child of his own imagination, which will worship him as its father and origin.

This fully explains what otherwise would be quite beyond our comprehension; the world-wide popularity of the absurd, the monstrous and the impossible, which obtains in art and literature, in our own self-worshipping and man-glorifying age. Look at the novels which command the readiest sale and whose titles are in every mouth. Which department of the most successful magazines

and newspapers is the first read by the purchaser, and lacking which others are voted as dull, tame and uninteresting? Look at our modern dramatic and scenic entertainments, if we are to judge of their reality by the highly colored placards of announcement that deface the walls of our streets to the shame not only of right reason, but of common decency, but which ensure jammed audiences and long runs, than which nothing viler or more absurd could be imagined; and which in the eyes of a better heathen civilization than our own would appear to be the work of the imbecile or the insane for the amusement of their brother lunatics.

This cultivation of the absurd and the insensate passion exhibited for it is the logical development (human progress?) of the original satanic act,—"I will to be a god and affirm *a meipso*"; and which was presented to Adam and Eve as the temptation to *know* good and evil, and hence become of good and evil the god-creator. But as there can be no truth that is not a Divine affirmation, and conversely the affirmation of the divine, Satan was obliged to affirm a lie, of which the world is forced to acknowledge he is the father, the original author. A lie, pure and simple, is the absurd. Satan is, therefore, as is man, his dupe, the god of the absurd, as God the Lord is the God of truth.

The real point at issue, then, in the discussion of human rights and liberty in their enjoyment is between the supremacy of the Divine and human word. It is the question between the Divine reason why of creation and the human reason why; the first presenting to the world the problem solved by a spectacle of order, of peace, harmony and logical consistency; exhibiting a just balance between the authority of the government and the obedience of the governed; between the infallible dicta of the Church and the reverential, yet free, faith of the believer, costing indeed man's willing self-dethronement from the chair of divine doctrine which can only be occupied without sacrilege by the Word of God, but bestowing upon mankind divine rights and assured liberty beyond the comprehension and reach of the human word; liberty without license, equality without anarchy, and fraternity without communism; while the other has never succeeded in presenting anything but a series of contradictory theories, speculations and delusive promises of a future regeneration, always to be, but never realized.

The stream can rise no higher than its source, neither can he give what he has not. How, then, without the sanction of the Divine Word, can man speak of his *sacred* rights—parental, social, political or religious—unless there be a God to whom they are sacred; unless His word of truth has consecrated them and stands ever ready with power to vindicate them?

The clear announcement of the doctrine that the liberty of man follows upon his recognition of truth was made by the world's true Regenerator when He uttered these remarkable words: "*You shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free.*" By whom and how that word of truth continues to be promulgated in every age the world needs not now be told. If it be grossly ignorant of more than a tithe of the blessings which it owes to her supreme presence and authority and ungratefully refuses to repay its debt of gratitude to her; if it proudly scorns to reverently kiss the hand of the martyr-victim who time and again has gone to death for its love, it at least knows, by the universal instinct of its rebellion against the supremacy even of God and of truth, where resides that calm, supreme, yet always suffering, power whose presence alone, and even the mention of whose name, is enough to arouse its antagonism and irritate it into an ill-disguised temper of mingled fear and hate.

Its champion sophists, busy with schemes of her overthrow and destruction, have never troubled their heads about the pretensions of the rank and file of the hundred and one man-forged systems of religion outside of Catholicity, knowing well that their common principle of private judgment is quite sufficient to nullify all their efforts to impose a Divine authority upon mankind, and, indeed, only serves to make them useful allies against the common enemy; and who, when unable of their own strength to sustain their attitude of rebellion against her, are quite willing to join hands in the secret compact of a satanic brotherhood with the infidel and the blasphemer of Christ in order to deal her a foul blow; whose advancement in the *degrees* of their servile fraternal (?) relations in their lodges will be found to be in an inverse ratio to their own firm faith in and spiritual submission to the God of truth and His divinely Incarnate Word.

Alone, face to face with a false and lecherous world, the Virgin Bride of God stands, seen and known of all as such, untouched, unsullied, pure as she came forth from the hand of her spouse, Himself, the Word of God, proof against all wiles, threats, and buffetings dire to wheedle, cajole, purchase, or compel a violation of her sacred honor and virtue; serene in the conscious possession of inviolability and infallibility, because she is clothed with the chaste ægis of that which yieldeth not, neither can be severed nor defiled —the seamless garment of Truth.

Thus invested with the authority of the God of truth and inspired to be for man the seer of the Divine reason why of his creation and destiny, the Church says to the world: In my authority lies the highest sanction of all human rights and surest guarantee of intellectual and moral liberty. Destroy my authority and you banish

from the earth the only infallible teacher and just vindicator of those rights, and deprive man of the freest privilege of his nature—the power of divine appeal. This we propose to show in the succeeding pages of this essay.

It has been our purpose hitherto in the course of this essay to draw our readers' attention specially to the primary and fundamental principles of human rights regarded in their source and sacred sanction, upon which is based the liberty of their exercise. We have shown that the very idea of right is founded upon a basis of truth, a theological truth, whose ideal can be no other than the Divine intention to be willingly conformed to and realized by mankind. That, as man only receives and cognizes, but cannot create or originate, truth, his affirmation of human right must be the affirmation of the Divine right in all human relations.

The human mind may be said to know facts which are the manifestations of truth, and are therefore justly called *true*, and, as such, are compulsory upon the reason as a rule of action; but the absolute essence of truth is divine, and does not depend upon either the manifestation of it in a fact or of man's apprehension of it. That is to say, facts do not make truth, but truth manifests facts. This explains why man cannot make a truth, but only cognize its manifestation.

The logical deductions of reason end with the assertion of facts which are in their nature antithetical, whose thesis is to be found in the Divine will or intention, and of which terms truth in its universality (uni-diversity) in creation and totality or unity in God is the synthesis.

The antithetical fact of human liberty is observed both as deduced from the ethical relations of man with man and as existing more or less perfectly emphasized among mankind; but the authority from which it is derived and upon whose sanction its claims are based must be referred to a higher magisterium than human reason can furnish. That magisterium must be creative, originative.

Thus we say, liberty is *made for* man as man is *made for* liberty. Made by whom? Evidently by the Divine Will, which posits the thesis, "human liberty." Posited for what final cause? The perfect conformity between the act divinely willed—the expression of the divine word—and the ideal of that expression, viz.: "man with liberty" in the mind of the Creator, and this is nothing else than Divine Truth.

The language of all mankind in affirming any human right is so far logical that it asserts the reason of those rights to lie in the affirmation that man was made for them and they for him. Even when it is said that they are inherent in his nature, as implied, *e.g.*,

in the American Declaration of Independence, it is only another manner of saying the same thing.

The rights of man can be deduced, indeed, by reason from the investigation of the phenomena attending those relations into which mankind instinctively falls by an ethical necessity of the life of the race,—the family, society, government and religion; but it is plain that those rights are no more the creations of human will or wisdom than those institutions themselves are. They are founded in his nature by the Divine Intention, for which reason they are justly deemed by mankind as sacred.

Whosoever, therefore, infringes just human right must make account with God, who will defend and vindicate His own Divine Will and word of truth. All deprivation of human right manifested in some form of tyranny is the consequence of the original sin of the race, which in denying the positing of the thesis by the Divine Will, and arrogating to human reason the power of creating right, must equally deny the antithetical nature of right as a Divine fact; asserting it to be something which man has made by his own will, and not something which is referable to the creative word and free will of God.

For if it were of man, evidently the synthesis cannot be expressed otherwise than as the diversity of human opinion, instead of as the totality or unity of Divine truth. One need hardly take the trouble to prove that diversity of human opinion is the same thing as the diversity of error, the logical cause and fruitful source of all tyranny.

For tyranny is the assumption of power which is not God-given nor God-sanctioned with the consequent denial of Divine responsibility; and he who dares play the part of a tyrant, by the very fact arrogates to himself what he denies not only to others, but to God Himself. He exalts himself to be his own god, but he becomes the god of the false, the unjust: and the archangelic question—"*Quis ut Deus*"—"who but God only?" is the sentence that proclaims his arrogance and his act as damnable in the sight of God and men.

Tyranny has therefore always shown itself jealous of the assumption of divine authority by either the family, the state, or the Church, and has always, as well, shown its true animus by the arrogance of its claims, and by its laughing to scorn all pretensions to cite it before a divine tribunal. Tyranny knows well who is its enemy, and who, if not successfully conquered or kept at bay, will most certainly deprive it of its prestige and power over those whom it enslaves. And this is equally true of all tyranny, whether of kings or of mobs; as true of those horrid monsters of the French Revolution and the Commune as of an English Henry VIII. and his daughter Elizabeth.

As error is, by its very nature, tyrannical; being the fruit of pride and self-deification; so tyranny, while fearing and persecuting truth, has ever been tolerant of error; if for no other reason than that error is the mother of discord, envies and jealousies, which weaken and disintegrate its own vital force, and prevents the formation of any formidable, united opposition.

The Catholic Church is right, therefore, when she proclaims truth as the ægis of human liberty; repeating the doctrine of Jesus Christ: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." It is the mission of the Catholic Church not only to proclaim this doctrine to the nations, but to interpret it and to vindicate it. Even supposing liberty claimed and rights known,—which, without Divine revelation intimate to the reason or more fully declared extraneously, we assert to be impossible,—mere force is of little or no account in this question. It is doctrine which rules and fashions the world, forms the character and decides the destinies of nations.

The hope of mankind must ever rely upon the proclamation and victory of doctrines that are true. He must be a charlatan, indeed, who would pretend that erroneous or false doctrines, if not *per se* harmful, could be of any positive benefit to mankind.

Whoso says doctrine says,—that which is taught. It is the meaning of the word. There is always a teacher who sits in the chair of doctrine with a just or usurped authority. The unthinking multitude, busy with the baser cares of life, think, as they are flattered by demagogues to believe, themselves to be fully qualified to pronounce upon all questions of human right, as being the source from which all rights emanate. The popular maxim, *vox populi, vox Dei*, they translate to mean, the voice of God is what the voice of the people decides to be true, which is only saying in other words that man is the creator of truth, and that his *ipse dixit* is its ultimate criterion.

That he is led to make this arrogant assumption by the original sin of his prevaricated nature, we have already shown. Mankind is ever the slavish dupe of the satanic promise, "Ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." Yet he is not left a helpless victim of the demon of pride, for this spiritual tyrant of man is quickly cast down from his throne by the question of the Archangel of the Word of God. *Quis ut Deus?—Who* but God only? And the speculations of sophists of every age sound like vain babblings when compared with the Divine solution of all problems that can engage the powers of the human intellect pronounced by the singer of the praises of God. "*Deus scientiarum Dominus est.*"—God is the Lord of all science.

Hence the rights of man based upon the ethical or moral order

always go hand in hand with liberty in the logical or intellectual order, and perfect liberty in either order is impossible without an infallible divine criterion. Error must enslave, as truth must give, freedom to both the intellect and will. Deny to the divine criterion of truth its legitimate authority, and at once a flood of false and illogical doctrines is poured forth upon society to be surely followed by the spread of a mephitic exhalation of demoralizing and corrupting influences in which all human rights enervated and poisoned quickly die.

The intellectual liberty which distinguishes certain epochs of history will be found to have been based upon the assumption that theology, or the science of God, is the *universal* science, offering in the knowledge of God as Supreme Reason a divine criterion for all knowledge; the light in which all facts are discerned as effects in their causes.

We, who live in an age which posterity will despise, where it does not pity it for its slavish idolatry of the intellect, gaze with wonder, as pigmies viewing giants, upon those great minds prostrate before the altar of the austere worship of truth, and look with envy upon the happy lot of a people whose age realized in the enjoyment of true liberty of mind and heart, almost to triumph, the Beatitudes of Christ.

He who is able to trace the all-powerful influence of doctrine upon the social condition of the nations cannot fail to contrast the former civilization, indebted, as it was, to the willing homage paid by the human intellect to the legitimate authority of divine truth for its stability, order, freedom and moral elevation, with the present disturbed, unstable condition of modern society in which every human right is put in peril, the family relation vitiated and its constitution undermined by divorce and unnamable crimes, the rights of property threatened by anarchy and socialism, the political order subjected to the tyrannical encroachments of heartless capitalists and the ambitious schemes of the corrupt creatures they elect to serve their own base ends, while the ignorant masses follow with superstitious credulity one religious fanatic after another, who are forever reforming their illogical and inconsistent creeds.

Our intelligent reader, who has followed us thus far in the statement of these clear and evident principles, will not fail to draw for himself the undeniable deductions from their consideration, viz.: The necessity of a universal, infallible authority possessed of divinely discriminative and judicial powers, lacking which the world would be condemned to the tyranny of error, without the benefit of appeal. Without such an authority the Divine intention could neither be clearly made known to and willingly obeyed by man, nor, when disputed, fairly interpreted and, when infringed, justly vindicated.

This is the claim of Catholicity, and, as all the world knows, of Catholicity only.

Strangely enough, the confession of this necessity is sometimes unwillingly made by her enemies. We find an instance of this in a lecture delivered a few years ago with the express intent of denouncing the Catholic Church. Said the lecturer: "As searchers after truth we must acknowledge some standard, and appeal to some recognized authority. Without this we must follow either our own mental bias, or else become the prey of every man who shall be bold enough to declare that *he* has and holds the truth of God."[1]

Humanity everywhere and at all times seeking for truth and struggling against the tyranny of error claims from God a universal Teacher of the truth and a universal Judge of error: infallible as both. Not self-constituted, nor self-authorized, but taught of God, and sanctioned by Him, whose infallibility and authority must therefore be divine. Only such a teacher is competent to judge between man and man, between truth and error, and always decide for the truth, else certitude would be impossible and dispute endless. The rights of man are both universally and indisputably true, and thus the same teacher must be invested with the power to condemn error, and require complete submission to its judgment. This, again, is the claim of Catholicity, and of Catholicity alone.

It will not be irrelevant to say, just here, that the attribute of infallibility enjoyed by the Church is not dependent upon the intellectual acquirements of those who at any time form the body of the living Church in this world, taken either singly in the person of its head or in the aggregate of particular portions, or of the whole body of the faithful, though as a fact the Catholic Church has ever embraced the majority of those men of great learning who have honored the age in which they lived by their superior philosophical discernment and profound judicial wisdom.

All men are by nature fallible, and no aggregate amount of the learning of fallible men could ever produce infallibility. It is a divine attribute with which the God of truth has invested His Church as the bride of Christ; Himself the infallible Word of God. Her language is indeed the language of men, but her word is the word of God, because her spirit is the spirit of all truth. Possessing, as every Catholic does, the divine touchstone of truth; being united in the solidarity of an infallible society, his faith is humanly

[1] Lecture by Rev. Dr. Harwood, being one of a series denominated "Price Lectures," a legacy having been left by a person of that name in order to defray the cost of an annual lecture, "whose object shall be to contradict the errors and superstitions of the Church of Rome." Boston, Mass, is the intellectual centre about which an audience is annually gathered to hear these "contradictions."

reasonable as his reason is divinely faithful. This harmony between the human and divine intelligence, which the virtue of the principle of reversibility in Christ restores, is the basis of the capacity for infallible certitude which is one of the *characters* of the Christian. As he is included in the Christian, divine, *essentially* logical, because infallible, order in which he is supernaturally born, he possesses the criterion of certitude which enables him to discern and correct the aberrations which are possible in the human, *accidentaliy* illogical, because fallible, order in which he is naturally born. So, as the Apostle says, "as all in Adam die, so shall all in Christ be made alive," we may also say: As all in Adam are made fallible, so all in Christ shall be made infallible. As "the pillar and ground of the truth," the Church is then the immovable foundation as well as the sure support of the whole arch of truth in its synthetic harmony and unity.

Hence arises a singular and even miraculous result. The authority possessed by the Church is one which inspires a willing, loving obedience, the only meritorious homage which truth accepts. In the spirit of that loving obedience man overcomes his natural demand to believe nothing without his own consent, sacrifices his predilection for error, renounces his own self-sovereignty, and brings his reason into accord with that of others.

Thence arises that greatest of all wonders, the unity of faith and reason among Catholics in all things infallibly decided by the divine authority of the Church. Most wonderful also is the fact that the more humble the submission of man's intelligence to that authority, the more perfect becomes his intellectual freedom to seek and know the truth, freedom from the worst of all shackles of the intellect, self-conceit and pride.

Inconsistency and illogical reasoning, even upon the most ordinary topics, is one of the most plainly-marked characteristics both of the conversations and writings of those living in communities whose system of education is based upon the idolatry of the intellect, falsely and unphilosophically conferring upon the intellect that imperium which is only enjoyed by the will. They are like ships without rudder or compass, beaten about by every wind of doctrine. It is the bane of the vaunted secular education of our time. The consequences are patent upon the face of the pages of our current literature "as thick as leaves in Vallombrosa"; but in logical consistency, and as serving the highest and most worthy purpose of literature, the search after and praise of truth must be condemned, with rare exceptions, as utterly valueless.

Truth cannot give its glory to another; and the secret of this inconsistent, illogical frame of mind which prevails among those lacking divine faith, is referable to the original, primal cause of all

error and absurdity, the capital sin of the race, self-glorification to the dethronement of God and His divine authority. Centuries ago this principle was announced by the Divine Founder of Catholicity when he said: "*Qui à semetipso loquitur gloriam propriam quærit. Sed qui quærit gloriam ejus qui misit eum, hic verax est.* He that speaketh from himself seeketh his own glory, but he that seeketh the glory of Him that sent him, he is true."

Error must follow after pride, and produce confusion of doctrine among the leaders of thought, destroying all hope of unity of faith among the masses, who, becoming enraged with their false prophets, turn upon them and rend them. As has been well said: "Sophists are followed by revolutions, and revolutions are succeeded by hangmen."

Prophetic were the words of the mother of the Incarnate Word of truth: "*Dispersit superbos mente cordis sui.* He hath divided the proud against each other in the conceit of their heart."

On the contrary, humility is one of the most remarkable traits observable in the writings of the great doctors in the Catholic schools of theology and philosophy, whose phenomenal learning has been the admiration of all ages; and we dare assert and challenge contradiction that among all classes of Catholics, even in the humbler walks of life, there is found, in a vastly superior degree to what is observed among those who are without faith (which is begotten of humility of heart), that plain, direct, straightforward, honest form of speech, indicative of an ability to apprehend logical argument, and which can only proceed from the enjoyment of superior intellectual liberty. It is this liberty which marvellously preserves them from the influence of the pretentious and subtle sophistries thrust upon them under every guise in speeches, newspaper and magazine articles, and in the entertaining books of the day, to say nothing of the over-much lauded works of graver import. It is not easy to mislead and thus intellectually enslave a faithful Catholic by fallacious reasoning. He possesses the touchstone which detects the presence of all error—his divine faith. But if he can once be induced to eat of the tree of good and evil, and revolt against the divine authority of the Church in the hope of becoming "as a god," he falls an easy prey to the first *ism* which offers itself to him as a stepping-stone to his own self-enthronement. Every heresy is the child of intellectual pride, and in itself necessarily an illogical and self-condemnatory act, assuming the authority and right to decide what is and what ought to be divine truth on its own confessedly fallible judgment, which in the same breath as "private judgment" it invests with practical pretensions of infallibility.

Heresy ever recruits its adherents from among the ranks of those

in whose eyes the forbidden fruit of self-sovereignty seems fair to behold and sweet to the taste. That it is quickly disintegrated and broken up into discordant, warring sects is not surprising. What would be surprising and even miraculous would be the preservation of unity by any heresy. "*Dispersit superbos mente cordis sui.*"

The view of infallibility that we have presented is more than a sufficient answer to those who ignorantly pretend that the submission of the intellect required by such a doctrine either abridges or nullifies its free exercise. The gravamen of the complaint at bottom is not that the matter upon which the so assumed infallible decision of the Church falls is or is not true.

Mankind would never object to the Church deciding whatsoever seemed good in her eyes, provided she was willing to acknowledge that she is, after all, as fallible as any individual man or other organization of men. What the heart of man is naturally jealous of is his own authority, and what he questions is the right to demand the galling acknowledgment from him that God is the Lord of *all* science, and that there is any extrinsic authority whatsoever which requires of him, by its own right, to believe anything on that authority. This is the secret of the railing antagonism shown by so-called scientists to the doctrine of infallibility. They do not want God to be the magister who teaches them, as He certainly does by being the author of reason, any truth which it is possible for reason to certify either as a fact of experimental observation or as an application conformable to any laws deduced by it from the observation of facts; for, on the same principle that God, as *Dominus scientiarum*, could require belief in the simplest proposition, or the most commonly known physical laws, he could also require belief in facts beyond all human observation, or in truths affirmed as applications conformable to laws not deduced, neither deducible, by human reason.

Knowing that man is not, neither can be, the author or origin of truth, the self-crowned princes of the kingdom of science in our day are envious of the authority and originality of God, and so attempt to comfort themselves with the thought that, there being some irrefragable laws exhibiting in their application indisputably true facts, these laws, and consequently (why not?) the facts also, are equally binding upon God as upon them, and boldly draw a conclusion, which even the premises granted will not warrant, that the essential nature of truth, as well as its diverse affirmations in created existences and their life are independent of the Divine Being and of His will—things which He has not affirmed, and over which He can exercise no right in their regard superior to man. This is the spirit which flatters the pride of man that he is "as a god."

But once that they abdicate this self-deification and acknowledge God to be Himself the essence and reason of all truth, there is an end to all dispute of the divine *right* to require submission of the human intellect to an infallible authority, and also an end to the possibility of a supposition that anything whatsoever can be true if it contradicts that infallible authority, or conversely, that the infallible authority could possibly require the submission of the mind to anything that is not true. No longer is it deemed irrational to "believe firmly without doubting" truths proposed by Divine authority which in their nature are out of the range of human discussion or experiment; but, on the contrary, it is seen that it is reason itself, freed from satanic envy and pride, which dictates such belief to be as necessary and binding as are the authority and its right to require it.

The assumed antagonism, therefore, between faith and science which is so eagerly cherished and so industriously presented under every guise to the ignorant multitude in order to discredit and nullify the divine magisterium of God and the Church, is absurd, impossible, and false.

The practical exercise of this divine attribute by the Church in the fulfilment of her mission in the conduct of human affairs, by the proclamation and vindication of God-given human rights in the social, political, and religious order, and which has given to the world all the justly prized blessings of a civilization indisputably due to her Divine establishment and power, itself coeval with, and both the logical and ethical development of, the act of the incarnation of the Divine Word of truth and love lies before us written upon the pages of history for nineteen centuries.

The strongest and really invulnerable proof of her having been all and done all she claims to have been and to have accomplished, will be found to lie in the fact that she has survived all attempts at her destruction, has succeeded in her work in so wonderful a manner, has miraculously kept her unity of organization and faith, has civilized the nations, reduced tyrants to subjection, protected the downtrodden, freed the slave, blessed and comforted the poor, confirmed authority in government, sanctified obedience, regulated society, and led millions up the difficult and thorny paths of virtue and heroic sanctity, not because of the divine truths she announced as the vicar of the Word of God; not because of the miracles she performed; not because her doctrine was, in fact, the highest and holiest and most marvellously logical and convincing that it is possible to conceive of; but, paradoxical as it may seem, *in spite of all these things.*

For it is precisely against infallible truth, the manifestation of miraculous power and the exhibition of holiness, moral purity, and

devotion to justice that mankind has ever arrayed itself in a phalanx of opposition and deadly hate; stirring up persecutions, confiscations, banishments and exile, penal disabilities, secularizing by force and fraud the institutions of the family, government, education, and even religion; thus robbing them of their divine virtue and strength; denying both the facts and the possibility of miracles in the very face of them; poisoning the wells of truth by pouring into their pure waters one stream after another of atheistic philosophy, and covering their clear, pellucid surface with the thick scum of doubt; denouncing all heroic virtue and self-denial from which society is all the while reaping unnumbered blessings as unnatural, and the perfection of holiness as fraudulent hypocrisy; tearing down with revolutionary violence and iconoclastic brutality what the Church has for centuries laboriously and patiently built up; sacrilegiously robbing the fruits of sacrifice made for the spiritual and the eternal to aggrandize the sensual and the temporal. But, when they have done their worst, astounded and baffled, they are forced to see that they themselves, by her crucifixion at their hands, have contributed, through the divine mystery of suffering's all healing, purifying, exalting, and irresistibly attractive power, the very means of their own defeat and of her victorious resurrection.

Yes, it is the cross, at once symbol and instrument of sacrifice and death, that has conquered and will ever conquer the world, the flesh and the devil. Truth can be denied or betrayed, miracles can be ruled out of testimony, sanctity can be travestied or ridiculed, but the cross of suffering and death has that invincible and magical virtue which conquers those in whose hands it is a weapon of offence, and transforms the now crucified victim into a victorious Saviour of the self-conquered enemy; the cross, the only power that overcomes man and wins God, whose name is a word of mystery, interpreted in the language of the world to mean slavery, shame, and death; but in the language of the Church, freedom, glory, and life.

THE POPES OF THE RENAISSANCE AND THEIR LATEST HISTORIANS.

Ludwig Pastor's *Geschichte der Päpste*, Vol. I.

Canon Creighton's *History of the Papacy*, Vols. I., II.

Leopold Ranke's *History of the Popes*, Vol. I.

THE English-speaking Catholic who would read a connected story of the Popes is still dependent on a translation of the amiable, if not devotional, work of M. Artaud de Montor, or of the no less vigorous and quite as unmodern Abbé Darras. The non-Catholic whose reason-loving, light-seeking mind is not satisfied with the family version, unrevised, of the life of Alexander VI., and the comprehensive synthesis of that homœopath of truth, Dr. Draper, is none the less at a loss for books after he has read the time-honored work of Ranke. Having exhausted these not inexhaustible sources, Catholic and non-Catholic are thrown back on an odd volume of Hurter, Voigt, Bowden, the searching inquiries of Mr. Archibald Brower, formerly Counsellor of the Inquisition, or the hurried summaries of the Church-history, or the anti-Popery pamphlet. The more serious student, sufficiently equipped to deal with French, German, and Italian works, has been hardly less hampered, so scattered was the material—largely used with the sole purpose of illustrating political history—so considerable the connected and fragmentary publication of new sources, so various the criticism of authorities, and so evidently incomplete the discovered testimony concerning certain individuals, certain facts, and certain periods. To have one period rounded, all the so collected material critically studied, grouped, brought out into the full light of day, honestly, artlessly, with mastery, without any of the false glamor that is bred of fine words, or pretty philosophy—to have the whole method of the work exposed, and to hold in one's hand a key giving entrance to the worker's study, a catalogue noting every step of his progress, is, assuredly, something to be deeply thankful for. And this it is which Ludwig Pastor promises to do for the history of the Popes during that most eventful period of time extending from the close of the Middle Ages to our own day. This it is which he has already done, especially for the life and times of Martin V., Eugenius IV., Nicholas V., and Calixtus III., viz., from 1417 to 1458.

Much as we may feel inclined to regret that there has been no

studious English work dealing with the history of the Popes during the last five centuries, and difficult as it may seem at first sight to explain the fact, we shall, on reflection, find little cause for regret and as little difficulty in explaining the fact. True liberty fled from England when the Pope's rightful authority was usurped. Robbed, persecuted, powerless to do any leisurely intellectual work, the little patriot band of faithful Catholics that held the field against all comers was necessarily, conscientiously, patriotically led to devote itself to the defence and inculcation of the great principles on whose existence the very life of Christianity depends. Hence it is that to-day, among English Catholic scholars, there are probably more learned men equipped for a theological and historical thesis proving the divine foundation of the Papacy, and showing its development in the first ages of the Church, than for an authoritative exposition of the action of the Popes in the modern life of the world. Habit and tradition play as large a part in the education, line of thought, literary effort, of a class or a nation as of an individual. As far as anti-Papal England was concerned, once force had strangled freedom of conscience, and the statute, the jail, the gibbet, the inquisitor, the official school-book and teacher, had made a history-primer to please benignant, ingenuous princes, there was every reason not to handle a dangerous subject critically, and no encouragement to deal with Popes in any wise, except as moral monsters from whom the spiritual offspring of the impeccable Henry VIII., and of the white-souled Elizabeth, had been providentially wrested, or as political enemies and anti-Christian usurpers, whose apocalyptic ending, foretold in clear words, was patent to every blind man. "It is," indeed, "no wonder that under the circumstances the place of History among the studies of the University became worse rather than better, or like that of Moral Philosophy, was lost altogether."[1] These words are quoted from the learned Bishop Stubbs, though with an application wholly different from the one given in his text. Their use here only serves to illustrate how searchers after truth may agree in a conclusion, though their judgment has been exercised on widely separate links in a chain of facts.

In France the modern revival of historical studies was first apparent, thanks to the appealing voice that never ceased to plead from every page of the noble "monkish" collections. The Germans, though the second to enter the lists, hold no second place to-day. Probably to their influence—for they have critically discussed periods of English history altogether neglected by Englishmen—we owe the more recent development of a school of English

[1] *Lectures on Mediæval and Modern History*, Oxford, 1886, p. 6.

historians, that gives promise of valuable work in the future, and that has already done honorable work. Just here it seems well to ask: Will our century, as so many claim, be known hereafter pre-eminently as a "scientific" age? The answer seems to be a loud No! if we consider the wonderful activity of the human mind during the latter half of the century in the way of a thorough study of history—an activity that is daily spreading in extent and growing in intensity. Italy, Spain, Russia, Hungary, Belgium are up and doing. In the last decade of this century the publication of sources, and of critical generalizations of periods and institutions, and of critical studies of persons, will add, beyond measure, to the value of existing material, and shed a piercing light on the whole field of modern history. When after generations seek a word to qualify the mental activity of the nineteenth century, so much are men the slaves of old words, it is not unlikely they will recur to a hackneyed term, and that our age will be known as that of the historical renaissance.

The new character which modern history has assumed necessarily, since it has been generally recognized as a treasury of knowledge and a well-spring of truth, instead of a sewer serving to fructify the soil of dynastic hates, princely or party ambitions, denominational prejudices and passions, infidel scurrility and bravado, is as noticeable in the work of contemporary Englishmen as in that of Germans and Frenchmen. Not that unsound and trashy books called histories are uncommon in England, but that we see the educated men putting Hume, and Gibbon, and Macaulay, and Carlyle, and Froude—great names—out of the university of history, into which they had coolly pushed themselves—rooming them, meanwhile, comfortably in the spacious and liberal college of literature. Freeman, Brewer, Green, Gairdner, Gardiner, Stubbs, —to mention only a few intelligent and persistent laborers—have done much in a serious, temperate, scholarly way to reform the methods of history writing in England.

Confining themselves principally to the study of the records of their own country, the later English historians have hardly ventured, as yet, to deal with the history of continental Europe; nor, if we except Canon Creighton's "History of the Papacy," have they attempted any critical history of the Popes in modern times. Indeed, it is to be regretted that Mr. Creighton had not delayed the publication of his interesting work some few years. It might have gained in completeness and in breadth, and it would probably have given more effective testimony to the excellence of English when compared with German scholarship, as we see it exemplified in Ludwig Pastor's "History of the Popes."

Mr. Creighton's "History of the Papacy during the Period of

the Reformation,"[1] of which four volumes have appeared, begins, properly speaking, with the year 1378, and the election of Urban VI. to the Papal throne, and ends with the close of the Lateran Council, 1517. Comparing these dates with the title of the history, we see that Mr. Creighton uses the word "Reformation" in a sense peculiar to himself. Nowhere does he define his meaning. If we turn to the "Preface" to Vol. I., we are not enlightened. "My aim in this book," says Mr. Creighton, "is to bring together materials for a judgment of the change which came over Europe in the 16th century, to which the name of 'The Reformation' is loosely given. I have attempted to do this from a strictly historical point of view,—by which I mean that I have contented myself with watching events and noting the gradual development of affairs. I have taken the history of the Papacy as the central point for my investigation, because it gives the largest opportunity for a survey of European affairs as a whole. I have not begun with the actual crisis itself, but have gone back to trace the gradual formation of opinions which were long simmering below the surface before they found actual expression. I purpose, if opportunity should be given me, to continue my survey in succeeding volumes to the dissolution of the Council of Trent." In the "Preface" to Vol. III. we read: "I am not writing a history of Italy, or of the Renaissance, or of the Reformation, but of the Papacy . . . ." From these two quotations it is apparent that, ordinarily, Mr. Creighton uses the term "Reformation" as loosely as other people, while, in the title of his work, he uses it still more loosely. Judging from his treatment of "the gradual development of affairs" in Vols. I. and II., it is possible that he thinks it more exact to carry the "Reformation" period backward to the moment when he can first "trace the gradual formation of opinions which were long simmering below the surface before they found actual expression." Why, however, fix on so late a date as 1378? The gradual formation of these simmering opinions can be traced to a much earlier date. There is no good reason why a historian should not be as logical in his title and preface as in his judgment of facts or persons. Logic is not, however, the most marked characteristic of the school in which Canon Creighton was educated. Like Bishop Stubbs, he avoids the "romantic" in narration, but finds place for it in the syllogism of facts.

Reviewing Canon Creighton's earlier volumes, Mr. T. Hodgkin[2] gives an estimate of the scope of the history as it stands to-day. "As Ranke's 'History of the Popes' takes up the thread of the

[1] *History of the Papacy during the Period of the Reformation.* By M. Creighton, M.A. London, 1882–1887, 4 vols.

[2] *MacMillan's Magazine*, vol. xlvii., p. 381.

story at the Council of Trent and continues it through the 16th and 17th centuries, it will be seen that this book (which treats the subject somewhat in Ranke's style and on similar lines) will, when completed and taken in conjunction with the German historian's work, furnish the reader with a complete history of 'the Great Latin Patriarchate' from the days of our Edward III. to the accession of the house of Brunswick." Unfortunately, the "conjunction" of Creighton and Ranke will not, as Mr. Hodgkin dreams, "furnish the reader with a complete history of" the Popes from the days of Edward to the accession of the Brunswickers, though Mr. Creighton does give a view of certain sides of Papal and non-Papal history during the century and a half preceding the so called Reformation, and does end where Ranke begins.

The reader who is not acquainted with Mr. Creighton's work may form a right estimate of its completeness with the aid of Lord Acton, certainly within his range of studies the most refreshing, informed, suggestive, historical critic that we English-speaking people have. Clear of vision and delicately frank in the expression of his judgments, he is gifted with a rare spirit of moderation and an enviable command of refined, diplomatic language, whose effect is immediate and lasting. Reviewing the two later volumes of Mr. Creighton, in the *English Historical Review* (July, 1887, pp. 571–581), of which, by the way, Canon Creighton is the editor, Lord Acton values "The History of the Papacy during the Reformation" in these words: "Next to the merits of moderation and sobriety which the preface rightly claims, their first characteristic is the economy of evidence and the severity with which the raw material is repressed and so kept out of sight as not to divert the reader's attention or turn his pleasure into toil. The author prefers the larger public that takes history in the shape of literature, to scholars whose souls are vexed with the insolubility of problems, and who get their meals in the kitchen."

Though Lord Acton's criticism is based on the later volumes, the reader need have no hesitation in applying it broadly to the whole work. The weakness of Mr. Creighton's method is cleverly brought out in the following passage from Lord Acton's review: "There is some risk in attempting a smooth narration of transactions belonging to an age so rich in disputed matter and dispersed material and quick with the causes of the Reformation. As the author rarely takes stock or shows the limit of his lore, the grateful student, on whom proofs are not obtruded, cannot tell whether they abound, and may be led wrongly and injuriously to doubt whether the sources of information and suggestion have been fully explored." In other words, cruder words, Mr. Creighton's "History of the Papacy" is a "popular" history,—a "faith history," so

to say,—that kind of a history in which the writer is apparently his own chiefest authority, a history whose "economy of evidence" and severe repression of proofs protects "the larger public that takes history in the shape of literature" from any troublesome doubts, but sadly vexes the soul of the inquiring student.

Von Ranke prepared his readers for his studies of the Popes in the 16th and 17th centuries by a single chapter of some thirty short pages, wherein he assumed to sketch the development of the Papacy from the year 1 of the Christian era to the year 1500. After the same fashion, Mr. Creighton, in something less than fifty pages, gives his version of the same story up to the year 1378. While the two chapters that make up this "Introduction" gently and speedily carry the reader into the agreeable flow of the later narrative, they do not rightly prepare him to acquire a just estimate of Church or State during the fourteen centuries "so rich in disputed matter and dispersed material." Mr. Creighton finds the Church and the Pope in history, but in the Popes he seems to see only the founders, the makers and, in good time, the blind or providential destroyers of a Papal monarchy. With this monarchy, more as a civil than as a religious power, and just because he is pleased to view it more as a civil than as a religious power, Mr. Creighton is principally engaged. It was De Maistre, who said so many bright things, that advised near-sighted men not to read history. "They lose their time," said he. Will not some witty Englishman enlarge the proverb so that it may include writers of history? Time is so valuable.

The defects of Mr. Creighton's "Introduction" are nowhere more apparent than in the few pages dealing with Hildebrand before and after his election to the Papal chair.[1] Here we have facts, it is true, but, at the same time, an economic repression of material that deserved more generous treatment. The picture of Hildebrand is not unsympathetic. The artist has caught the features, but not the expression, the soul of the man. Nor does he show forth the living age in right relation to Pope, Church, or State. A professed "Introduction" that is not an introduction places a stranger in a false position. The student and the scholar may be safely left to provide for themselves. Twenty pages of Döllinger's slight sketch, "The Pope and the States of the Church,"[2] will help to give life to Mr. Creighton's earlier pages. The reader who is willing to take some history in a form that does not deserve to be called unliterary will certainly lose nothing if he omits Mr. Creighton's introduction, and replaces it by the first one hundred and fifty pages of the first volume of Cesare Cantù's "Gli

[1] Vol. I., pp. 14–17.

[2] See *The Church and the Churches*, London, 1862, pp. 336–353.

Eretici d'Italia,"[1] a work which, though it has served students for nearly a quarter of a century, is still deserving of an English translation. The admirable and learned work of Cardinal Hergenröther, "Catholic Church and Christian State,"[2] whose reading might well be made obligatory on all unfledged "philosophers" in our colleges, will cast a larger light on the changing, intricate, though not confused relations of the Papacy with Christendom and its temporal rulers. The larger public that finds pleasure in a pleasing literary dress, as well as the student who seeks for deep, enlivening, suggestive thought, a broad view of the past and the present, and an intimate acquaintance with the best material, will surely prefer to introduce himself to the great Hildebrand through the good offices of the learned and original Mr. Lilly.[3]

The different effect of Mr. Creighton's "History" on two very different minds, as shown by a further extract from Lord Acton's criticism and from Mr. T. Hodgkins' notice, may serve to point a moral. "Mr. Creighton," says Lord Acton,[4] "is not striving to prove a case, or burrowing towards a conclusion, but wishes to pass through scenes of raging controversy and passion with a serene curiosity, a suspended judgment, a divided jury, and a pair of white gloves." The measure is perfect, with the slightest qualification. While not "striving" to prove a case, Mr. Creighton certainly has a case, and a close eye on the jury. He may not be "burrowing to a conclusion," but it is only because he prefers to glide. Otherwise there is nothing to be added to or taken away from Lord Acton's acute criticism. Mr. Creighton preserves his gloves almost intact. They are seemingly just a size too small for a historian of the Papacy during the 14th and 15th centuries.

Mr. Hodgkin is a historian, the writer of a not unpopular book on "Italy and her Invaders." He does not wear gloves of any color. His criticism is reminiscent of the "drum and the trumpet." He has read Mr. Creighton's story of the Great Schism; and this is what he has learned. "Not a gleam of honest, conscientious difference in principle ennobles the contest between Rome and Avignon. It is simply a question which of two greedy old men shall have the right of standing at the turnpike-gate and taking toll of the wayfarers to heaven, which shall have the Annates flowing into his treasury, which shall have the power of reserving the fattest bishopric in Christendom for his nephews and their friends."

---

[1] *Gli Eretici d'Italia*, Torino, 1865, 2 vols.

[2] *Catholic Church and Christian State*, London, 1876, 2 vols.

[3] See "The Turning-Point of the Middle Ages," being Chapter II. of Vol. I. of *Chapters in European History*, London, 1886.

[4] *Eng. Hist. Review, l. c.*, p. 527. Full justice to Lord Acton's review could only be done by a reprint. Lord Acton's reviews are real pages of history.

"We cannot afford to speak contemptuously of any sort of knowledge," says Bishop Stubbs, "and God forbid that we should speak contemptuously or hypercritically of any honest worker"[1]—and, in this spirit, we quote Mr. Hodgkin, word for word. But imagine Canon Creighton's feelings as he read this confession of the historian of "Italy and her Invaders!" Doubtless De Maistre's proverb rushed to his lips.

The notion of Mr. Creighton's work conveyed in this extract is more than unjust to him. Whatever his sins of commission or omission, he is always moderate, fair in statement, as far as his statement goes, honest and temperate in his judgments of persons and acts. Indeed, if the "History of the Papacy" had no other value, it would deserve to be read as a model of tolerance and reserve. Mr. Creighton can rightly claim that he has not allowed his judgment "to be warped by a desire to be picturesque and telling." "What we want to see," to quote the always quotable Bishop Stubbs,[2] "is men applying to history and politics the same spirit in which wise men act in their discipline of themselves; not to cease to be partisans, not to cease to hold and utter strong opinions, but to be as careful in their party behavior and in their support of their opinions as they are in their behavior in social circles, their conversation in social life." And it is in this spirit that Mr. Creighton has written. He deserves the largest credit, and there can be no hesitation in agreeing with Lord Acton, that, "it is by the spirit and not the letter that his book will live."

When Ludwig Pastor's later volumes have appeared we shall be able to compare his work with the history of Ranke, which during more than fifty years has been the standard modern history of the Popes for German and English non-Catholics. As it is, Pastor is still dealing with events that happened full sixty years before the period at which Ranke begins the "History of the Popes." For its time, Ranke's history was a rarely good book, a surprise to Protestants of all denominations, who had been brought up on a literature of fables and abuse, and a greater surprise to Catholics, who had patiently reached a conclusion that Luther and the princes had knifed truth beyond the hope of recovery. This was her first gasp, and she showed wonderful signs of vitality. With all its popularity, the German "Ranke" has not gotten beyond a seventh edition. The movement of the Papacy during the last half of the present century disturbed some of the German historian's most settled views; just as the movement of the Papacy during the coming century will disturb the settled or the hesitating views of a crowd of more and of less learned people. Ranke amended his

[1] *L. c.*, p. 13. [2] *L. c.*, p. 20.

title and modified from time to time, in small ways, his studies of the Renaissance and his sketch of the Popes of the 18th and 19th centuries. At last, realizing the importance of the material that had accumulated since 1834, and the consequent decline in value of his statement of facts and of his judgments, he conceived the idea of a wholly new edition, worthy of the scholarship of the day. Considering his age and the revolution in history-writing directly resulting from the action of Leo XIII. in throwing open the Vatican archives in 1884, no one will regret that Ranke's scheme was not carried out. Pastor's work promises to give us the history that was needed, and that is more than Ranke could have done under the circumstances.

It is especially curious to note Ranke's estimate of his own moral, or intellectual, or religious—in any case, personal—fitness for writing the history of the Popes. "An Italian or Roman, a Catholic,[1] would enter on the subject in a spirit very different from mine. By indulging in expressions of personal veneration or, perhaps, in the present state of opinion, of personal hatred, he would give to his work a peculiar and, no doubt, more brilliant coloring; on many points he would be more elaborate, more ecclesiastical, more local. In these respects, a Protestant, a North German, cannot be expected to compete with him. He regards the Papal power with feelings of mere indifference; and must, from the first, renounce that warmth of expression which arises from partiality or hostility; and which might, perhaps, produce a certain impression in Europe. For mere matter of ecclesiastical or canonical detail, we can have no true sympathy; on the other hand, our position affords us different and, if I am not mistaken, purer and less partial views of history. For what is there in the present day that can make the history of the Papal power of importance to us? Not its particular relation to ourselves, for it no longer exercises any essential influence, nor does it create in us solicitude of any kind; the times are past in which we had anything to fear; we now feel ourselves perfectly secure. Popery can now inspire us with no other interest than what results from its history and its former influence." With this apology before us it is easy to form an estimate of history and historians before Ranke's day. The great German could afford to be honest "because he was not a Catholic and because modern Germans had nothing to fear from the dying Papacy!"

Ranke's honesty can be freely admitted, but unbounded honesty by itself will not make a historian. Ranke assumed that the main thing in his favor was his Protestantism, while in reality this was his chief defect No man who is not a Catholic can write a true

[1] Author's Preface, Foster's Translation, p. xvii.

history of the Popes. And this fact, patent to any scientific mind, is now broadly acknowledged by non-Catholic thinkers. Right reason would have forced the general acceptance of this principle in time; Pastor's "History" has already made it evident. Zarncke's "Literarisches Centralblatt,"[1] reviewing Pastor's history at some length, says: "He is a Catholic, and in his presentation never disavows the Church's standpoint. But this standpoint in no wise clouds his view of historical truth. He honestly seeks to do justice to phenomena and persons which, exactly because of his view of the Church, he cannot easily sympathize with. Indeed, in many respects, this Church standpoint undoubtedly qualifies him for a more correct and becoming conception of persons and circumstances than would be possible for one-sided non-Catholic inquirers and writers of history." What a pleasure it is to see and to feel the world move! He who would write the history of the Church or the Popes must needs be a member of the Church, saturated with the spirit of the Church, filled with the soul of the Church, learned in the doctrines of the Church, loving truth as only the Church loves it, bold, honest and fair, as only the "Papist" dare be. Then, given judgment and the other necessary talents, the South African may be trusted with the work as safely as the North German.

Ludwig Pastor does not tell us, in his preface, where he was born, nor what religion he professes. He saw the need of a new history of the Popes, and preparing himself for so serious an undertaking by the most thorough studies, he offers the public the first volume. Here is a "History" committed to the world by a historian just as the chemist presents a "Chemistry," an astronomer a volume of "Astronomy," a geologist a work on "Geology." Pastor is not writing for those only "who now feel themselves perfectly secure," or for those who see the Papacy "tottering to its fall." He is giving to all men the latest results of the science of history. Instead of his human genealogy we have the record of his intellectual genealogy—a list of the five hundred and thirty odd books and collections and the thousand and more manuscripts distributed in one hundred private and public libraries and official archives, that he has consulted and used in the pages of this single volume, "dense with new knowledge," as Lord Acton says. In order that the estimate we have given of Mr. Creighton's history may not admit of question, and in order that every reader may be able to see, once for all, the vastly different methods of the scientific and the "popular" school of historians, we shall quote a

[1] See No. 44, p. 1522, 1886.

couple of passages from Mr. Creighton's preface to his first volume:[1] "The circumstances of my life have not allowed me to make much research for new authorities, which in so large a field would have been almost impossible. What I have found in MS. was not of much importance." "My work has been done under the difficulties which necessarily attend one who lives far from great libraries, and to whom study is the occupation of leisure hours, not the main object of life." The modest unpretentiousness of these statements will hinder any fair man from dealing with Mr. Creighton's work hypercritically, but they bear witness to its slight character when compared with the work of a historian whose life has not been spent far from great libraries, to whom study is the main occupation, the circumstances of whose life have made it seem a duty to spare no labor in the search for new authorities, and who has found material of considerable importance in manuscript after manuscript. "The inner mind of the Papacy has to be perused through many other collections pertaining to the several countries, churches, and religious orders," says Lord Acton justly, and Pastor has, at least, perused the collections.

A pupil of the great Johannes Janssen, we are not surprised at Pastor's diligence, thoroughness, compactness, detail, sacrificing drudgery. He has sought new sources not alone in Germany, but also in Austria, Hungary, Italy, Belgium, France, and England. Before him no historian of the Popes had free access to the secret archives of the Papacy, to the manuscript collections of the Vatican library, of the Inquisition, the Propaganda, the library of St. Peter and of the Sixtina. Neither Ranke, nor Gregorovius, nor Von Reumont, nor Mr. Creighton, made any use of the valuable sources which have supplied Pastor with more than two hundred and twenty-five important manuscripts. In an appendix he prints no less than eighty-six documents heretofore unpublished, and these are only a beginning. In the succeeding volumes he will print a large number of hitherto unused official acts, letters, and bulls, illustrating the period he has so successfully studied.

Pastor's "Introduction," as the reader may readily imagine, is not, after the fashion of a Creighton or a Ranke, a "*tendenz*" chapter out of a "popular" history or a handbook. He is about to write the history of the Popes during a period of transition, when the so-called Middle Ages are ushering in the "Modern" era, when an old body of ideas, feeling the breath of a new life, begins to develop fresh and active organs and faculties, gathers physical and intellectual force with time, and day by day effects a visible change in men's views of life, eternity, government, morality, and culture. The centre of this powerful factor in the history of the

[1] *History of the Papacy*, Vol. I., p. viii.

modern world is Italy, the ever ungracious home of the Popes. There, under the impetus of the Christian Petrarch, and the not un-Christian Zola of his day, Boccaccio, the new learning is speeding its way over the land, and influencing all the currents of society. To read of schisms and councils without reference to the evolution of the "Renaissance," is to read of schisms and councils, but not to learn history.

In Germany and France the "Renaissance" has of late been a favorite subject of study. Almost every side of it, literary and artistic, has been described, discussed, illustrated. The English "larger public," whose hunger for knowledge is not satisfied with the lean books of Mr. Roscoe on Lorenzo the "Magnificent" and Leo X., have for some years found a refection of more substance, and certainly more pungent flavor, in Mr. Symonds' volumes. The greater part of the work thus far done, if not designed wholly on the lines laid down by Burckhardt, has at least been largely influenced by his notions and his spirit. And with all Burckhardt's diligence, originality, quick observation, and apt appreciation, he has had the misfortune, not uncommon, of choosing a point of view from which he could not possibly take in the whole course of the winding, circling streams of the "Renaissance." The elevation that satisfied him was much too low down. Pastor, surveying the scene from a higher range, gives a broad, free sketch of the "Renaissance," suggesting detail on every hand, and distributing the lights and shadows truthfully, quite regardless of mere picturesque effect.

In the "History of the German People" Janssen traced the double current visible in the stream of humanism as it flowed through the field of German civilization. Pastor follows these two currents—one Pagan, one Christian—to the very fountain-head of the stream in Italy. When the Church came into being she lost no time and spared no labor in the effort to purify the turbid waters of Pagan learning. The works of the early fathers show how large a measure of success the Church attained, and time bears witness to her generosity, her sacrifices, her intelligence in utilizing, distributing, preserving the purer sources of ancient thought and imagination. Holding her divine mission well in view, the Church sought to instruct mankind in the right use of Pagan art and literature, as intellectual aids to the spread of the Gospel, of truth, and of Christian refinement; indeed, of morality and religion. Monachism was, from its foundation, the source of an ever-living, ever-acting renaissance.

The revival of classical studies coincides with the "Babylonian Captivity," the Great Schism, the consequent weakening of the Papal authority—and therefore of Christianity. It was a time of

great political disturbance. All the forces of absolutism were arrayed against the Papacy, hoping through its necessities or its fall to acquire an unrestrained mastery over men's consciences and bodies. Clergy and people fell into the clutches of heresiarchs, the bonds of morality were loosened, Christian ideals were temporarily lost sight of. Among the lovers of the new learning there arose a sect that accepted Pagan philosophy, poetry, rhetoric, not as handmaidens of Christianity, but as goddesses in a new pantheon. Valla set up Pleasure instead of Christ, and naked Vice instead of Christian virtue. Becadelli, Poggio, Filelfo, were proud of rivalling Ovid or Catullus in obscenity. Fate, Fortune, were the gods of men like Salutato, Marsigli, Marsuppini. Paganism was revived in a Christian land. Christianity was mocked, its doctrines reviled, its servants abused and libelled. Men busied themselves with composing Ciceronian diatribes against monks and nuns, and elegantly filthy protests against vows and virginity. We are living witnesses of the speedy work of filth in defiling, and can readily estimate the effect of the naturalist school of the 15th century on the public morals.

However, the historian of the "Renaissance," whether Protestant, Catholic, or infidel, owing to a mistaken sense of art, or to imperfect knowledge, or prejudice, or to an *a priori* view of history in general, based on the unscientific theories of the powerful, "short-sighted" school, has, traditionally, given undue prominence to the classically immoral, the pagan, the revolutionary aspects of the 15th century. The "classical" Christian, the virtuous, the holy features of the age have been kept in the background. There are ten men who can write dramatically of crime to the one whose art is pure enough, simple enough, to move men with the divine comedy of virtue. Does this, in part, explain the general tone of all our literature? Whatever be the answer to this question, it is with a sense of gratitude that we follow Pastor as he re-arranges persons and events in right relation, and does justice to the goodness as well as to the evil of the "Renaissance."

Petrarch, and even Boccaccio, enthusiastic lovers and forwarders of the new learning, were, at heart, firm Christians, and saw with regret the dangerous road their disciples were pursuing. Manetti, one of the most learned men of his day, the first Italian humanist to take up the study of the oriental languages, a philosopher and, though a layman, a theologian, was a model of every virtue, and a bold defender of the Church. Traversari, the monk, gathered the learned world of Florence, laymen and clerics, in the monastery of Santa Maria degli Angeli, to study Greek and Latin, philosophy, theology and literature, and busied himself with gathering rare manuscripts, and copying and translating them. Like his teacher,

Manetti, he was ever encouraging others by speech and writing to love learning. Bruni, whose dead body he crowned with the laurel, was, like Corraro and Barbaro, devoted to Christian as well as pagan learning, and used both for the honor of God and the moral well-being of men. Vegio, moved by the eloquence and the sweetness of St. Augustine's "Confessions," gave his life to the study of sacred and profane literature, and in his works on education showed how the one should be fused with the other in forming the perfect Christian scholar. Vittorino da Feltre, that ideal of a pedagogue with a mission, whose school was a pilgrimage house for students from France, Germany, and the Netherlands, as well as from every part of Italy, inspired men with a love for the "humanities" vivified by the love of God; and taught his lesson not from book alone, but by a wonderful example.

The false ways into which many were seeking to turn the new learning were apparent to thoughtful men. The prudent called attention to the dangers ahead, and sought to protect society against them by the spread of right principles. Unfortunately the hot-headed, the hasty, were as irrational in their methods as were the "poets" themselves. A cry went up against all Pagan learning. The Church, the Popes, gave no heed to this senseless cry. Clement of Alexandria, more than a thousand years before, had answered all such silly protestants. From Petrarch's day, through all the trials of the Church and the Papacy, Churchmen and Popes encouraged the new learning, fostered all the arts, patronized, supported, and honored the humanists. To use the wisdom of the ancients—"a gift from God"—to serve God's purposes, is a tradition as old as the Church. Pastor's suggestive sketch of the noble and ignoble tendencies of the early "Renaissance," is supplemented by a valuable page on the education and dutiful devotion of the monks, as evidenced by the rich remains of pulpit oratory that have come down to us, and the long list of preachers famed in the 15th century. And the splendidly wicked character of the time is rightly balanced by a record of its still more splendid holiness. Fifty men and women of the century have been honored by the Church with the title of Saint or Blessed. The world is busy today canonizing the unholy in history. Have the rationalists, the naturalists, the agnostics, been able to find fifty atrociously impious humanists of the 15th century worthy of a modern anti-clerical statue? Even so, they will be no less indebted than we are to Pastor's "Introduction," which points the way to a rational treatment of the history of Italian humanism.

Having traced the early development of the new learning, Pastor casts a glance at the history of the Popes from the beginning of the exile at Avignon to the end of the Great Schism. This part

of his work the author subdivides under three headings: "The Popes at Avignon, 1305–1376"; "The Schism and the great heretical movements, 1378–1409"; and "The Synods of Pisa and Constance, 1409–1417." Here Pastor enters upon ground already covered by Creighton; but Pastor's purpose and method are not at all Creighton's. Indeed, a comparison of the latter's thin, pale drawing, with Pastor's solid, learned sketch, would be unfair to the English historian.

From the beginning the Church has been engaged in a contest for the liberty of the Church, and that is to say for the freedom of mankind. Applying in a larger sense the admirable words of Mr. Lilly concerning Gregory: the one aim of the Popes has been to free the Church "from the fetters, whether of vice or of earthly tyranny, to vindicate her claims to absolute independence in carrying out her mission, as a society perfect and complete in herself, divine in her constitution, divine in her superiority to the limits of time and space, in the world but not of it, a supernatural order amid the varying forms of secular polity." The natural defects, the human weaknesses, the sins, the crimes, if you will, of individual Popes have not swerved the Church from her heaven-appointed mission. The long struggle with the German emperors tested to their utmost the aims, the courage, and the talents of a line of Popes that fought for and maintained the rights of the Church against all the odds of human power and inhuman device. For notwithstanding the glowing pages that tell of the wondrous, the extravagant power of the Papacy during the Middle Ages—a power that the "popular" historian imagines to have been created out of nothing, then seized upon by itself, and finally established by means of forged "donations" and "decretals," and the unholy use of force and threats—the facts show that the Popes of the time were, as far as temporalities were concerned, nominal rulers. Exiles, the sport of emperors, kings, robber soldiers and mobs, the story of their wanderings and their bitter trials cannot but move the most hardened reader's sympathies. Kings and emperors, greedy for unrestrained power, ambitious to be Popes, persecuted, threatened, defied, attacked Pope after Pope. When the Hohenstaufens went down before the righteous hand of God, liberty in the presence of the Popes breathed freely; but her wounds were deeper than she knew. In the long struggle with the emperors, the Popes had been forced again and again to seek refuge in France. Ambition and greed were at work there, and sought pay in ecclesiastical power and honor, in church property and church money. Then came the larger ambition, the imperial ambition to control the Papacy itself. Forced to lean on France, the Church naturally fell under French

influence, and though Boniface VIII. declared that "he had rather be a dog than a Frenchman," within two years after his death Bernard d'Agout, as Clement V., ascended the Papal throne (1305), and for the following seventy-three years the Church was ruled by Frenchmen. The period of the "Captivity of Babylon" was one fruitful with evil for the future of Christianity; and the seven French Popes that reigned at Avignon are judged to-day quite as severely as they were by the Italians and Germans of the 14th century. It is a question whether they deserve all the blame that has been lavished on them. The French and the Germans are seemingly agreed that their forefathers, whether Popes, kings or emperors, are fairly chargeable with a large share of the ills which the Church has suffered in the past. Whether the historians of either nationality have succeeded in justly apportioning the exact share of responsibility that is chargeable to the other side of the house, is somewhat doubtful. Probably an American, a true cosmopolitan, will eventually settle the matter. It is an advantage, sometimes, not to be too deeply rooted in the past.

Whatever the faults of policy, or of government, of the French Popes, they were all, as Dr. Pastor shows, respectable in intellect, and, considering the times and the difficulties of their position, fairly good rulers. Benedict XII., Clement VI., Innocent VI., Urban V., Gregory XI., in a senate of the world's governors, would have no cause to hide their heads. Reviewing Pastor's "History" in the *Revue des Questions Historiques* (January, 1887), M. Godefroy Kurth calls attention to the unwonted justice done these Popes by the learned German author. Their ceaseless activity in the work of spreading the Gospel among heathen nations has not hitherto received due recognition. The first of the Avignon Popes, Clement V., and his successor, John XXII., designed a noble plan of missions in India, China, Egypt, Nubia, Abyssinia, Barbary and Morocco. The later French Popes were active in cultivating the good seed so generously sown by their predecessors, and the large hearted Clement VI., the staunch protector of the persecuted Jews, has left a record of his intention to carry the missions to the most Eastern limits of Asia. As Pastor says, neither the history of these great foundations, nor indeed of the French Popes, can be fully written until their *Regesta* have been published. This important work is now being done under the fostering care of Leo XIII. In time, Mr. Creighton or his continuator will be better able to judge the value of the influence of the views of Marsiglio of Padua, and of Occam, upon the world, when these views can be fully compared with the apostolic ideas of the Avignonese Popes.

To form a just judgment on this period and on the development

of later centuries, we must have before our eyes a clear, full view of the social conditions of the time. Dr. Pastor has given us such a view. Towards the end of the 13th century there was a general improvement in trade throughout Italy, the Netherlands, France and Germany. With good times came luxury, extravagance, loose living and a love of pleasure, confined to no single class. The clergy did not escape the contagion. It invaded the Papal court. Politicians cried out for the reform of the Church. The Popes and the clergy are always the Church when the man with a beam in his eye sees the monstrous mote in the eye of authority. There were no greater enemies of reform, when there was question of reform, than the temporal rulers. A vast number of the clergy were their creatures; and reform would have compelled them to be true churchmen or would have ousted them. Reform at such a price was too costly. But, against all the odds, Benedict XII. was a reformer; Innocent VI. cleaned out his corrupt court and announced as his rule of action "that Church honors must be the reward of virtue and not of birth." Urban V. was a radical reformer, who made his father give up a pension he received from the King of France. Simony was a vice of the day, but it was an old vice. If "the traffic in livings was conducted as openly and unblushingly throughout Europe as it is conducted in England to-day,"[1] it is not more surprising to find the *curia* buying and selling than to see an emperor auctioning to the highest bidder the benefices he had either seized or acquired under threats or as a peace offering. The age was greedy and luxurious. Pastor says—the judgment is, perhaps, severe—that the moral condition of society was lower than it had been at any period since the tenth century. It is well to remember that during the "Babylonian captivity" there were other men alive besides the French Popes. To explain the action of all the forces of the world by the defects of one is easy, but such an explanation satisfies only the "near-sighted" men.

At the first conclave held in Rome for 75 years, the Italians recovered the Papacy and the rash Urban VI. entered on his career of passionate, imprudent, well-meant reform. Within a few months the French Cardinals had set up Robert of Geneva as an anti-Pope, and the sad period of schism opened. The effect of this fatal move in disorganizing the Church everywhere, in fixing and increasing the evils already so marked among clergy and people, the impetus it gave to shameful heresies, to the spread of communistic and revolutionary ideas, to doubt, division and contempt for the whole hierarchy, are so clearly and effectively brought out in Pastor's following chapters that the reader cannot fail to get a larger grasp of the world and the Popes at the beginning of the 15th century.

[1] *Chapters in European History*, W. S. Lilly, p. 127.

Consciences were disturbed, holy men and women supported the anti-Popes, the kings and the princes cunningly played, now with Pope, now with anti-Pope. Through the necessities of its position the Papacy, which had so long fought for freedom, became entangled with the civil power. Quick to take advantage of these necessities, civil rulers usurped ecclesiastical rights and put forward new claims. There were not wanting canonists to defend the royal or imperial encroachments. Frequent attempts at compromise between Popes and pretenders were foiled by political chicanery. To have a Pope of one's own was most convenient. Indeed, the civil rulers were more Popes than the real or pseudo-Popes.

Meantime, the true reformers were not idle. Noble men like Groot and Radewin went down among the people, educating them and awakening them to better lives. Innocent VII. fostered the arts and sciences he so much loved, and, with all his troubles, revived Boniface VIII.'s plan for a Roman university. The humanists, Christian and Pagan, were gathered into the Papal court. Their talents and acquirements made them serviceable, but they were treacherous servants, often, and used their knowledge and the experience gained in the Papal offices to injure the patrons that gave them bread.

At length, under Gregory XII., there was a new movement for union. When Gregory halts there are appeals to a future Pope, to a better informed Pope, to a universal Council, to Jesus Christ himself. Finally, we have the synods of Pisa and Constance. Mr. Creighton's first volume is taken up, principally, with the details of the conciliar movement and of the doings at Pisa and Constance. After reading Dr. Pastor's *resumé*, the student may fill up the picture with varied detail out of Mr. Creighton's interesting book. The Pisans declared that both Gregory and the anti-Pope, Benedict XIII., were heretics, and "removed" them. Then the brave Cardinals made a third Pope, Alexander V., in the interest of union. After the death of Alexander V. came John XXIII., "more of a warrior than a churchman." At length Pope and anti-Popes agreed with the Emperor Sigismund to submit their claims to a general Council to be called at Constance. John XXIII. was deposed; Gregory resigned and was appointed Cardinal Bishop of Porto; and Benedict XIII. fled to the mountain fortress of Peñiscola. "I have not understood the world and the world has not understood me," were the last words of Gregory, who died in 1417, two years after his resignation. As we read Pastor's instructive analysis of the world of Gregory's day, we sympathize with him. Who could understand such a world?

If the power of the Papacy was ever endangered, if it at any time

seemed to be "tottering to its fall," to use Mr. Ranke's hackneyed prophesy, it was in 1417, when Martin V. put on the tiara. The Council of Constance had claimed to be superior to the Pope—a revolutionary proceeding. The Papal See was vacant, and so remained for two years; the Council ruling the Church. Huss, convicted of heresy, had been burned at the stake (1415), but schism and heresy were more rampant than ever in Bohemia. The laity and the lower clergy were loud in their attacks on the upper clergy; monks and priests were preaching revolution in the town of Constance itself; morals had not improved; reform seemed as impossible as ever. As far as the Church and the Papacy were concerned, the greatest danger lay in the attack that had been made, from within, on the Constitution.

There is always a crowd of good people in the world who love peace at any price. They were satisfied, happy. But the schism was not at an end, nor did it disappear until the resignation of the anti-Pope, Clement VIII., in 1429. Of the reign of Martin V. (1417–1431), who, by his skill, persistence, and courage at length closed the schism, Dr. Pastor gives a comprehensive study. Writers of primers, of handbooks, of biographies, and indeed of history, will find in the life of this Pope, as well as in that of Eugenius IV., Nicholas V., and Calixtus III., a wealth of material closely compacted, and affording the most valuable indications for the study of the political, social, intellectual, and religious movements during a half-century of extraordinary activity. The character of each of these Popes is pictured from all sides; the individuality of the great churchmen, who operated in every field, is realistically portrayed; the growth, the rise and fall of old and new opinions, are closely traced. Again we feel the power of the scientific method of the school of Böhmer and Janssen, and the vast uses of noble "drudgery."

In the light of recent events in Italy we are tempted to suggest that a "cheap edition" of a work giving a sketch of Rome *without* the Popes, could not but serve a patriotic purpose. During the "Babylonian captivity" the great city became a ruin and a den of robbers. Christian and Pagan monuments were neglected and destroyed. The churches were roofless. In the Lateran, as well as in St. Peter's, the cattle grazed. When Urban V. returned to Rome, his first care was to repair the buildings and churches, and to improve the material condition of the capital of Christendom. The Romans, the Italians, have always viewed the Papacy with the eyes of the emperors and the kings as an instrument of a mighty power which they longed to control, and as a treasury whose funds they were greedy to appropriate. No sooner had the Popes housed them decently, put coin into their purses, and pushed them

onward in the way of the highest human civilization, than they assumed the airs of beggars on horseback. To leave them to themselves was to turn them into a mob of poets and orators, shouting abuse, howling defiance, but, more than all, whining about the unity of Christendom, the wounds of the Church, the sanctity of the Apostles, and begging that the power that made them, and without which they were a by-word among the nations, should speedily submit to their cultured barbarism and crack-brained arrogance.

The schism brought misery and ruin upon Rome, which, at the election of Martin V., "had not even the form of a city." So abject was the poverty of the people that on the Feast of St. Peter and St. Paul, 1414, they could not provide lights for the illumination of the "Confession" of the princes of the Apostles. Hardly a Pagan monument was standing. Hadrian's tomb was in ruins, the houses were barely habitable, the churches were stables—we can trace *this* Italian tradition very far back. The city walls had tumbled down. Wolves paraded the streets and played the *rôle* of resurrectionists in the graveyards. Martin outran the "Renaissance," renewing streets, houses, churches, the Vatican, St. Peter's, St. John Lateran. To Rome he led Gentile da Fabriano, Pisanello, Masaccio, masters all, to beautify the churches, and to enkindle in the unlovely Roman citizen a love for great art and religion. The arts of the goldsmith, the jeweller, the die-cutter, the decorator, were warmed into new life under the sun of the Papacy. Within a few years Eugenius IV. was driven from the city. When, in 1443, he returned after an exile of ten years, he found the streets were highways, where the cows, sheep, goats, leisurely browsed. Historic monuments had been passed through the lime-kiln, precious marbles had been stolen from the churches, houses and churches were unclean, unrepaired, the wolves were as nonchalant as ever, and the blatant Roman discussed grave political questions in classic rags and tatters. Eugenius initiated a new renaissance. Houses and churches were again set in order, the Pantheon was "restored," Ghiberti and Filarete were freely encouraged to immortalize themselves in gold, and jewel, and bronze, and blest Angelico was called to lift the world to heaven.

But it was under Nicholas V., who would, if he could, "have given all his means for books and buildings," that Rome became, indeed, the centre of Christendom. Such was the deliberate aim of this great Pope—to make Rome the centre of religion and of all the arts; to set up there enduring witnesses of the might of God, so that men might be strengthened in faith and seek high things. Nicholas knew the worth of the Papacy to the world. He recognized that the one great need of the world was that the Popes

should be independent of the rabble of kings and mobs; that the Popes should be the owners of a home that they could defend against all comers. Then would they raise the world, whether it willed or not, to heights it did not dream of. Nicholas spoke the words—more still, he did the deeds—that make Rome what it is, and entitle it to-day to be what it is not—to the shame of all Christians be it said—the city of the Popes, as it is, even now, the source of the one true Christianity.

Pastor's summary of the mighty doings of the "Founder of the Papal '*Mäcenats*,'" is certainly the most complete that has thus far seen the light. Artists, literary men, patrons, students of the "Renaissance," of general history, or of the Papacy, will here gather new knowledge, new views, and, perhaps, new ambitions.

Mr. Creighton's first two volumes cover this period; in fact they close only with the reign of Pius II. Pastor's first volume ends with the death of Calixtus III., the predecessor of Pius. Comparing the two works—not to refer again to the radical differences between Pastor's method and Creighton's, between the breadth and learning of the former and the restricted and not too learned handling of the latter—the reader cannot fail to be impressed with the apt remark of Mr. Lilly on Dean Milman's interesting book: "How difficult it is for a Protestant clergyman, however scholarly and accomplished, really to enter into the spirit of an age dominated by religious conceptions so radically opposed, in some important respects, to those of which he is a professed exponent."[1] This difficulty is a hindrance to a true judgment on Catholic conceptions in the 15th, or in the 19th, as in the 11th century; and a stumbling-block not only in the way of Protestant clergymen, but of non-Catholics in general. Friedrich Nippold, that staunch Evangelical, has stated the case boldly and justly in his "Geschichte des Katholicismus seit der Restauration von 1814." Discussing Bismarck's "Kulturkampf" and its fiasco, Nippold charges it "especially to the general ignorance of Catholic things among diplomats." Lord Acton, in a learned, suggestive review of Mr. Lea's "History of the Inquisition," seems to imply that this defect is noticeable even among Americans who are neither clergymen nor diplomats. The ability to enter into the spirit of Catholic conceptions is particularly required in order to appreciate the action of the four Popes, whose history Pastor is writing, towards contemporary synods, heresies, and things spiritual in general. The trials, the successes, the failures of the Papacy did not abate its claims to spiritual power and independence, whether of councils, universities, chancellors, or potentates; claims which the Popes definitely established in this 19th century when their temporal

[1] *Chapters in European History*, p. 152.

power is almost as much of a shadow as it was, at times, in the 15th century.

Dr. Pastor has gathered most full and interesting material illustrating the character and the doings of the great literary men of the age: Ænea Silvio, Alberti, Tortello, Maffei, Biondio, and the whole group of humanists; and of the great Cardinals, Capranica, Cesarini, Albergati, Correr, Castiglione, Orsini, Vitelleschi, Scarampo, Bessarion, Carvajal, Torquemada, De Allosio, Cusa—to name but a few of the active, learned, intellectual, and spirited men that then honored the ever illustrious senate of the Church. Janssen has done justice to the learning and activity of Cusa. The reader who is innocent of the work of real reform done before that ardent, sweet-lipped, ascetic "reformer," Martin Luther, was vouchsafed to an expectant world, will read with amazement of Cusa's far-reaching reforms in the empire.

"Turkey, that curse of Christendom," says Bishop Stubbs, "means nothing, represents nothing, but butchery, barbarism and the vilest slavery." Had the Popes been able they would have saved Christendom from this "curse"; from "butchery, barbarism and the vilest slavery." But the rulers of the West were too much occupied in fastening absolutism upon so-called nationalities. They have not yet finished the work. The Popes saw the danger from the first, and lavished money, appeals, spiritual gifts, in the vain effort to awaken the men of Europe and the eunuchs of Constantinople to the fate that threatened both East and West. Pastor's pages testify to the foresight, the love of mankind, the energy, displayed by the homeless Popes in the effort to save our Christian civilization; and no less do they evidence the narrowness, the cowardice, of Greek and Latin. In his chapter on the "Fall of Constantinople" and in the history of Calixtus, Dr. Pastor details the ceaseless, self-sacrificing efforts of the latter and of Nicholas V. to undo what had been done, or at least to bar the further progress of the brutal Mahometan. The Greeks "had rather see the Turkish turban in the city than Rome's tiara." They see it there to-day. And what of the Western world, that later echoed the sentiment of Grand-duke Lucas? Disunited, torn by social, revolutionary, un-Christian ideas, it is forced to keep the "sick man" alive and to glory in the splendid "liberty" it enjoys under the splendid weight of 28,000,000 soldiers "at a total annual public cost of $600,000,000," and to look appealingly towards the "prisoner in the Vatican" to save it from the inevitable. Had the people been free in the 14th and 15th centuries the Turk would have been driven back. The Popes and the people are ever at one where freedom exists. Calixtus manned fleets, preached crusades, sold precious jewels, but France, England, Germany,

Naples—all, all were blind and tricky. Christian of Denmark stole from the cathedral the money gathered for the campaign against the Turks. Hunniades and Capistran were left to fight unsupported and to die in the face of the foe. When Europe failed him, the strong-hearted Calixtus appealed to Ethiopians, Syrians, Georgians, Persians, Turcomans, but he did not shame the pettifoggers who were busy debating the comparative value of the decrees of Constance and Basel. With the Pope's aid Scanderbeg, the "athlete of Christ," saved Albania; the Pope's fleet was victorious at Metelino, and Calixtus died hoping that his successor might be able to annihilate "the enemy of the Faith."

"There is hardly any other department," wrote Böhmer, "in which the spirit of irreligion and of opposition to the Church has done greater injustice and caused greater mischief than in that of history writing." To correct injustices, to undo evil, is worthy work. Truth corrects the one, undoes the other. History, like this of Pastor's, written in her interest, deserves the approbation of all loyal servants of truth. Echoing the words of Pertz, Leo XIII. has said in substance that a full knowledge of the acts of the Popes would prove their best defence. The facts presented by Pastor justify the saying. "It would certainly be displeasing to the Popes to maintain that they never were in the least to blame. We owe them only truth, and they require no more." So wrote De Maistre, and he put the case fairly. Pastor not only states the facts that are blamable, or that seem to be blamable; he also judges the facts, forming his judgment on the Popes, possibly with a stricter application of right principles than if he were not what he is, a Catholic. For the Catholic, having, through his acquaintance with the spirit of the Church, a higher ideal of the Papal office than it is possible for a non-Catholic to have, is apt, unwittingly, to measure the Popes by this ideal, however he may seek to apply to them only what the requirements of history demand. What these requirements are has been well stated by the learned historian, Maurenbrecher, in an article on the "Objectivity of the Historian," in the "Historisches Taschenbuch."[1] "It is, indeed, the historian's task to subject to his comparative criticism the moral atmosphere of the different centuries and of the different generations of men; but he should weigh and measure the individual man only in relation to his contemporaries, and only according to the moral notions and customs of his time." It will be difficult to find a Pope who was not an "individual man," and if no Pope be measured by a harsher rule than Maurenbrecher's, the most blamable will hold a very fair "comparative" place in history.

[1] Leipzig, 1882, p. 341.

With pleasure we learn, on good authority,[1] that the venerable Cardinal Newman has taken a lively interest in the learned and conscientious work of Dr. Pastor, and that arrangements have been made for the publication of an English translation of the first volume during the coming year. No scholar will hereafter venture to write or speak on the history of the Popes without a full acquaintance with this model work—a work that does honor not only to the writer, but to German Catholic learning. Nor will the general reader find the history less useful or less interesting. Written in a simple, agreeable style, neither its detail nor its array of authorities hinders it from being "popular" in the good sense of the word.

Dr. Pastor, who is "extraordinary" professor of history at the University of Innsbruck, had already made a name for himself through the "History of the Church movements for Reunion, during the reign of Charles V.," published in 1880. The promise he gave there is more than fulfilled in the present work, which, according to his design, will be completed only with the sixth volume. Between Janssen and Pastor we shall soon be in possession of material affording a larger insight than was heretofore possible into the development of the revolutionary movement in which the German "reformation" was merely a step. As Pastor's plan seems to have confined him more especially to a history of the Popes in their relations with Italy, the empire, and France, there is still room for a scientific history of their relations with England, Ireland and Scotland. No doubt we shall, before long, have such a history. Its need is apparent; and, in England, there is a little group of Catholic historians that gives promise of greater things in the near future. Soon we shall see an active critical school doing for English history what German, French and Italian Catholics are doing for the history of their respective countries.

When may we hope to see a learned school of Catholic-American historians doing its share of hard work in the cause of truth? Just now the willing student has every reason to be discouraged. Outside of the colleges there are few societies of learning. Catholic and public libraries are wofully deficient in the books without which no serious work can be done; and there is no word of a Mæcenas, and no sign of a Renaissance. If report speaks true, Dr. Ludwig Pastor is to occupy the chair of history in our new university. Should he come among us there can be no doubt that he will try to excite a genuine interest in sound historical studies, and that he will train a certain number of our young men in thorough

[1] Literarischer Handweiser (No. 468-469), 1888. The first volume of Pastor's history has been translated into French by Furcy Raynaud, Plon., Paris, 1888, 2 vols., 8vo.

methods. In order, however, that he may have the success he will deserve, and that we may fully benefit by the advantages his presence will bring us, the spirit of earnestness that fills our brethren across the sea must be wooed to our side of the water, and encouraged when she honors us with her vivifying presence. Possibly the words recently addressed by M. Domet de Vorges to a French public are not inapplicable here: "The last generation of Catholics has lived too much within the domestic circle; the new one must be turned towards larger ambitions."

ABELARD.

THE amatory phase of the life of Abelard has been so frequently the theme of poets and others of that type, that a general and crude notion concerning it is widely spread. Only the student, however, is aware that the "woes of Abelard and Heloise" are by no means the chief things for him to consider in the career of this extraordinary man; and that if Abelard were celebrated merely for the events of which Pope and others have sung, that career would find no place among the topics noticed by the serious historian. But the errors which he taught from his professorial chair, and his peculiar relations with the great St. Bernard which thence ensued, are worthy of close attention. Bayle, Mosheim, and other Protestant authors have shown great sympathy with Abelard, not because this philosopher was a contumacious heretic, for we shall show that he was not such; but because they would detract from the reputation of "the last of the Fathers," St. Bernard, who was the ambitious professor's chief opponent. Before entering upon a narration of the aberrations of Abelard and of the course of St. Bernard, we must give a short sketch of the former's life, for the popular version is in many respects inaccurate.

Peter Abelard was born in 1079, at Palais, a village about eight miles east of Nantes, in Brittany. His father was a soldier, but fond of letters, and hence the young Abelard was made, not a knight, but a scholar. When a mere lad, he became a real peripatetic, going from place to place, and disputing, wherever he found an opportunity, on dialectics. Arriving at length in Paris, he attended the lectures of the celebrated William of Champeaux, archdeacon of that diocese, and one of the first philosophers of his

time. At first William was greatly pleased with his new auditor; but he was vexed when he found that many of his scholars deemed the young man more fit than himself to occupy the chair. Already, in fact, Abelard gave unmistakable signs of those qualities which were to prove the bane of his life. Not only his conduct, as we learn from his contemporaries, but his own writings show him to have been vain, presumptuous, and jealous. He disputed that he might enjoy the pleasure of conquest, rather than for the sake of truth. Nothing pleased him so much as to weaken the reputation of other professors, and thereby entice away their scholars. He was a handsome man, possessed a charming voice, and was both poet and philosopher. But his own works show that he owed his success to his seductive externals rather than to phenomenal solidity of doctrine. In his letters he complains bitterly of his many enemies and of their persecutions; but it is too evident that many of these enemies were deliberately made such by himself, that he might defy and conquer them. Abelard was only twenty-two years of age when he opened a scholastic hall at Melun. His reputation became immense; and as he combated the views of his old master, William of Champeaux, on certain scholastic questions, the lecture-room of that unfortunate professor was soon deserted for his own. After a while Abelard removed to Corbie; but hearing that William had resigned his chair in Paris, and had become a regular canon, he went to Mount St. Genevieve, and there began to lecture. After a few years he intermitted his lectures, and attended the theological course of Anselm of Laon,[1] a famous professor of divinity. Here he undertook to lecture in opposition to his professor; but his proceedings being interdicted, he returned to Paris, where he soon acquired great fame and much money. Here we will succinctly but accurately narrate the events which have excited so much sympathy for Abelard. Until his thirty-fifth year he seems to have led an ordinarily exemplary life; but his tremendous pride needed a rebuke, and it received a severe one. About the year 1114, Abelard formed the acquaintance of the canon Fulbert, a beneficiary of the cathedral of Paris; and through the canon he came to know the canon's niece, a beautiful young woman, renowned for learning. He soon fell a captive to the attractions of Heloise, and deliberately designed her seduction.

[1] This Anselm should not be confounded with *the* Anselm, namely, the saintly archbishop of Canterbury, one of the most learned men of the Middle Ages. This confusion is sometimes made; thus, in Appleton's *Condensed Cyclopædia* we are told that Abelard "studied divinity at Laon, under Anselm, whom he also eclipsed." As there were, at that period, only two Anselms of very great name, viz., the saints of Canterbury and of Lucca, this non-qualification of the name, and the glorifying of Abelard with the term "eclipse," would mislead the ordinary reader.

Knowing that Fulbert was proud of his niece's mental acquirements, Abelard offered to reside in their house, and besides paying for his board, to act as tutor to Heloise. The offer was accepted, and Abelard himself tells us, in delicate and eloquent terms, of the result of his plot, namely, that Heloise became a too willing victim to passion[1]. In time, her condition compelled her to leave her uncle's house, and to betake herself into Brittany, to the care of a sister of Abelard. There she gave birth to a son, who was named Astrolabius. When Fulbert discovered the state of affairs, he naturally insisted that the parties should marry; Abelard was free to do so, for although a cleric, he was not in holy orders. Indeed, he would have married Heloise from the beginning; but he was ambitious of ecclesiastical preferment, and his overweening vanity led him to aspire to any height. If the alleged *Letters* of Heloise are genuine, and we shall show that they are probably spurious, she herself encouraged him in this conduct, preferring "to be his mistress rather than his wife," if she could only see him idolized by the multitude.[2] Be this as it may, Abelard now proposed marriage; but her answer shows that, learned though she was, passion had completely warped her mind, and that much of the sympathy extended to her has been misplaced. She told Abelard that it would be inglorious for him, whom nature had made for all women, to unite himself to one; that matrimony was full of vexations, and that Theophrastes and Cicero had declared that one man could not wed both a wife and philosophy; that "there was nothing common between scholars and servant-women, between cradles and writing-materials, between books and distaffs, between pens and spindles." In spite of these strange reasons Abelard persisted, and Heloise yielding, the marriage took place in Paris, the uncle consenting that it should be kept secret for the sake of the professor's ambition. But the foolish Fulbert, proud to have so great a philosopher for a nephew, soon boasted of his relationship; the servants also began to talk. Then Heloise denied that she was married, and finally Abelard persuaded her to quiet things by retiring for a time to a convent at Argenteuil, where she had been educated; she might don the nun's veil, but not take the vows. When this came to the ears of the canon and his kindred, they imagined that Abelard had tired of his wife, and had ridden himself of an encumbrance. Maddened at the fancied insult and burning for revenge, they attacked the professor and barbarously mutilated him. Shortly after his recovery, the humiliated Abelard, moved, as he himself testifies, more by shame than by devotion,

---

[1] *Letter to a Friend, on the History of my Misfortune.*
[2] *Epistle to Abelard*, No. 2.

took the monastic habit in the celebrated Benedictine abbey of St. Denis. Heloise became a nun at Argenteuil; and although in the letters which she *is said* to have afterward sent to Abelard, there are some expressions savoring of levity and even of a criminal hankering after the past, she seems to have finally settled into a contented and holy religious. In the course of time she became prioress of the convent at Argenteuil, and when the community was forced by the monks of St. Denis, who wished the house for themselves, to abandon Argenteuil, she took her nuns to the oratory of the Paraclete, which Abelard and his pupils, as we shall see, had constructed with their own hands, and afterward ceded to Heloise. While abbess of the Paraclete, Heloise was visited by St. Bernard. The Blessed Peter Mauritius, abbot of Cluny, greatly esteemed her; and in one of his letters he congratulates her as "a woman truly and entirely philosophical, who had chosen the Gospel instead of logic, the Apostle instead of physics, and the cloister instead of the Academy."

Had Abelard become a monk simply for love of quiet, although that would have been a merely human motive, and therefore unworthy, he might not have been totally disappointed. But having done so in pure disgust and shame, without any supernatural impulse whatever, it is not surprising that for many years his life knew but little of peace. Again, he seems to have brought into the monastery all the worldly spirit which had ever actuated him; his terrible experience had not lessened his pride of intellect, and when contradictions came, he knew not how to bear them. When Abelard first entered the monastery of St. Denis, his shame led him to remain withdrawn from the gaze of the world, but his reputation caused many demands to be made on his superiors for a resumption of his lectures. The abbot Adam soon gave the order, and once again multitudes of students were entranced by the oracles of their idol. But in the year 1121, the great master was accused of heresy before the Synod of Soissons; a book he had written on *The Trinity* was condemned because of errors on the omnipotence of God, and he was ordered himself to give it to the flames. He was consigned to the custody of the abbot of St. Medard at Soissons, but the Papal legate, Conon of Palestrina, released him and sent him back to St. Denis. Soon after this he became involved in trouble with the abbot Adam, owing to his opinion that the holy Areopagite was not the first bishop of Paris. By this he touched the monks of St. Denis on a tender spot, and so furiously did they resent his theory that they excited against him the ire of King Louis VI., telling the monarch that the honor of St. Denis was the honor of France; and it would have gone hard with the daring master had not Stephen, the royal steward, obtained for him the

privilege of leaving his monastery.[1] He sought the protection of Theobald, count of Troyes, and having obtained permission from his abbot, he constructed, in a beautiful solitude given to him by some admirers, a little oratory of reeds for a residence. His former pupils learning of this change, they came from all quarters to dwell around him and listen to his lectures, building, in the intervals of study, huts for habitations, and living as they best could, until the completion of a larger oratory which would contain the hundreds of scholars drawn thither by almost insane admiration of Abelard. When finished, this oratory was dedicated to the Holy Trinity, and as the professor had found much consolation herein, he called it the Paraclete. After a residence of a few years in this retreat, Abelard was chosen abbot by the monks of St. Gildas de Ruys, in Brittany; and as by this time he had advanced much in piety, he became very zealous in the enforcement of discipline. The consequence was that some of his monks several times attempted his life. After his condemnation in 1140 by the Synod of Sens, of which we shall soon speak, Abelard appealed to Pope Innocent II., and in the meantime accepted the hospitality of the venerable Peter, abbot of Cluny. For two years he edified that strict community by the manifestation of every monastic virtue. We shall have occasion to cite the letter sent by the abbot of Cluny to Innocent II. in favor of Abelard, but we here give a portion of the one in which Peter informed the abbess Heloise of "the master's" truly holy death: "I do not recollect of ever having seen his equal in humility; Germanus would not appear to the accurate observer more abject, or Martin poorer. When I forced him to occupy a superior position among our large number of brethren, he acted as though he were the last of all. I was frequently astonished while watching him in the processions, walking with the others before me, as I reflected how such a man contemned himself. And while there are some religious who desire

[1] The indignation of the monks of St. Denis was not unnatural, for one of their greatest glories was in the presumed fact that *their* St. Denis was the holy Areopagite. That the first bishop of Paris was *a* St. Denis seems to be certain, but the ancient and once almost universally received opinion that he was the Areopagite is now rejected by the best critics, most solid arguments being adduced to show that he flourished in the third, not in the first, century. From Hilduin in the ninth century down to Alexandre in the eighteenth, all who hold that the Areopagite was the first bishop of Paris base their theory on the tradition that Pope St. Clement sent a certain Denis to Gaul, and they conclude that this personage must have been the Areopagite simply because the philosopher was still living during the pontificate of Clement. But none of the ancient writers say that the Areopagite was made bishop of Paris, or even went into Gaul. On the contrary, the old Martyrologies make an explicit distinction between the saint of Athens and him of Paris; and the Roman Archives, whenever they cite the words of the Areopagite, always designate him as bishop of Athens, never of Paris, as they would do if he had been transferred to the latter see.

sumptuous clothing, he was careless in such matters, being content with simple garments of any kind. He followed the same system in his food, in his drink, and in every care of his body; condemning, in himself and in others, both by word and in practice, not only luxuries, but everything not absolutely necessary. His study was constant, his prayer frequent; his silence continual, unless when a conference of the monks, or a sermon to them, compelled him to speak. Often he approached the heavenly Sacraments, and as often as he was able he offered to God the Sacrifice of the Lamb. . . . . His mind, tongue, and actions were ever occupied in divine things, or on philosophy, or on matters of erudition. . . . . As he was troubled by an itch and other bodily ailments, I sent him to the mild climate of Chalons, and there, so far as his complaints permitted, he renewed his olden studies, and was ever at his books. As we read of the great Gregory, he allowed no moment to go unoccupied by prayer, or by reading, or by writing, or by dictation. The coming of the gospel visitor found him among these holy exercises. How holily, how like a Catholic, he made his Confession of Faith and then of his sins; how eagerly he received the Viaticum for his journey and the pledge of eternal life, the Body of our Redeemer; how confidently he committed his body and soul to Him, can be attested by all the religious of that monastery." With this consoling and edifying letter the venerable Peter of Cluny sent the remains of Abelard to Heloise, and she interred them in her convent of the Paraclete. This letter of the holy abbot is sufficient testimony to the repentance and holy end of Abelard, but the reader will doubtless find interest in the following, the first of two epitaphs which the venerable Peter sent to be engraved on the tomb of his friend: "Abelard was the Socrates of France, the Plato of the West, our Aristotle; equal, if not superior, to all the logicians who have ever lived; known throughout the world as the prince of learning; of genius varied, subtle, and acute; mastering all men by strength of reason and by artistic diction. But he triumphed the most when he became a professed monk of Cluny, and cultivated the true philosophy of Christ. Here he happily completed the days of a long life, leaving us the hope that now he is numbered among true philosophers."

There is much sickening sentimentality abroad in connection with the names of Abelard and Heloise; thousands, who know absolutely nothing of the consummate theologian and philosopher, sympathize with the unfortunate lover. Even certain serious historians play the school-girl, and manifest symptoms of hysteria when they touch on the "woes of Abelard and Heloise." Listen to the grave Henri Martin declaiming how Heloise offers to the world an example of real love, "of an entire surrender of one's

self"; insisting that the importance of Heloise "in the moral history of humanity" is not due to her extraordinary learning; telling us how, when immured in a nunnery, respected by the entire Church, she "does not change interiorly," does not undergo the mystic death of the cloister, never repents of her love, accepts not monastic asceticism, but "eternally" protests in her heart which (nevertheless!) is "so well formed for divine love"; declaring that this same unrepentant Heloise, "inconsolable and unsubmitting," appears like "a great veiled figure" at the entrance of "the moral world"; and finally congratulating "the just instinct" of those Frenchmen who have made of her "one of the national glories," because she is "the great saint of love."[1] Such ravings may suit the "Druidic school" of which Henri Martin was the head, but they should not be encouraged by a Christian. And whence this deluge of tears? Whether shed by Colardeau, Mercier, Saurin, Pope, or Martin, they are caused by the "immortal" letters of Heloise—letters which the last-named author regards as "bearing the characteristics of no epoch," but as "above all time"; as revealing "no accidental form of the soul," but its very "eternal depth." And yet, remarks a modern critic,[2] it would seem that these letters were no more genuine than those of Penelope to Ulysses, of Phœdra to Hippolytus, of Briseis to Achilles, of Sappho to Phaon, of Helen to Paris, which Ovid has transmitted to us. This prosaic truth has been well evinced by M. Lalanne,[3] from whose essay we extract the following arguments: The alleged letters of Heloise, so redolent of passion, contain many contradictions and impossibilities, and their tone is inexplicable. One can conceive how Heloise could have said such things to Abelard during the first years following their separation; but fourteen years of religious life had elapsed before the first letter was written. And here she speaks to a man fifty-four years old, exhausted by study, a wandering life, and persecution, and who now aspires only to eternal repose. Nothing checks her vehemence, and yet she is the woman of whom, shortly before, Abelard had said[4] that "the entire world admired her piety, wisdom, and inconceivable sweetness of patience in all circumstances; she seldom left her cell, devoting herself therein to holy meditation and prayer." And even if we admit, which it is very difficult to do, that from the day of the catastrophe to the moment when, expelled from Argenteuil, she and her nuns were welcomed by Abelard to the Paraclete, Heloise never met him, it is nevertheless certain that on this occasion she

[1] *History of France*, vol. iii., p. 315, edit. 1855.

[2] Larroque, *Errors of M. Martin*, published in the *Annals of Christian Philosophy*, Paris, February, 1863.

[3] In the *Literary Correspondence*, Paris, December 5, 1856.

[4] *Loc. cit.*

did converse with him, and more than once, and that scandalous rumors caused Abelard to put an end to such visits.[1] How, then, can Heloise complain that, from the date of her monastic profession, that is, from 1119 or 1120, she has not enjoyed his presence or received one letter from him? Nevertheless, in one of these letters (*v.* 1133), she so expressed herself. Again, insists Lalanne, "granting that Heloise, and, after her time, the nuns of the Paraclete, preserved the letters of Abelard to her, can we unhesitatingly admit that, during a wandering life and until his death, Abelard preserved her letters, which breathed an ardent sensuality that must have necessarily compromised that reputation for wisdom and holiness which she had acquired? Finally, these letters are very labored; everything is arranged in order; the vehemence of their sentiments never, for a moment, interrupts their method. Their extreme length, their erudite and very exact quotations from the Bible, from the Fathers, and from pagan authors, all convince one that they are not penned by a correspondent, but were leisurely elaborated, and with infinite art."[2]

---

[1] In the *History of his Misfortunes*, p. 36, edit. Duchesne, 1616, Abelard defends himself from these charges.

[2] In regard to the famous tomb of Abelard and Heloise at Père-Lachaise, an eminent archæologist, Guilhermy (in the *Archæological Annals*, Paris, 1846) says: "We must demand satisfaction from those who show, every day, so little consideration for historical iconography, in propagating errors which prescription will eventually raise to the rank of truths. Take, for instance, one of our most popular monuments in the cemetery of Père Lachaise, the tomb of Abelard and Heloise. How many illusions would vanish, if the pilgrims who here perform their devotions only knew that, in the construction of this elegant sepulchral chapel, there entered not one stone from that severe and learned abbey of the Paraclete which romancing troubadours have treated as a kind of temple of Venus. The columns, capitals, and decorations of the four façades came from the cloister and some oratories of the monastery of St. Denis. The eyes of an expert are not required for the discovery that these sculptures were not originally destined for one and the same neighborhood. It was M. Lenoir, Director of the Museum of French Monuments, who conceived the idea of uniting some of the fragments placed at his disposal, so as to form a tomb fit to receive the ashes of the two illustrious lovers of the twelfth century. For the men who had thrown to the winds the venerable ashes of St. Geneviève, of St. Marcellus, of St. Bernard, of Suger, were clownishly sensitive when they opened the tomb of Abelard and Heloise; being of opinion that honors rendered to these 'victims of the cloister' would give a rude blow to a fanaticism which the guillotine was not extirpating quickly enough. Therefore a casket, sealed by the republican municipality of Nogent-sur-Seine, brought to Paris the ashes taken from the tomb of the Paraclete. But before the remains were placed in their last resting-place, the amateurs of a new kind of relics were to be satisfied. It is said that one of the soldiers at Valmy wore a talisman made from the moustache of Henry IV. Well, philosophers and atheists, probably olden levelers of heads, seized on the few teeth left in one of poor Heloise's jaws, as safeguards in their lusts. A tooth of Heloise cost a thousand francs; Abelard's were valued less highly. . . . . The tomb was completed in the following manner: They took a bas-relief representing the funeral procession of Louis, son of St. Louis, and they decided that hereafter it should represent the obsequies of Abelard. The soul of the young prince, carried toward heaven by an angel, became that of the

It is certain that Abelard fell into several errors of doctrine, but there were many points in which his manner of expressing himself, rather than his teaching, was to be condemned.[1] The first condemnation of any error on the part of Abelard took place at the Synod of Soissons in 1121; he retracted what he was ordered to retract, and was sent back to his monastery by the Papal legate. But in after years, when he endeavored to discipline his unruly monks of St. Gildas, his adversaries accused him not only of again teaching the condemned doctrines, but of having put forth new errors. In the ranks of his accusers Abelard now saw the great St. Bernard, an adversary whose fame for sanctity and learning forbade any indifference. He therefore asked Henry, archbishop of Sens, to afford him an opportunity of defending his views in Bernard's presence. The prelate acquiesced, and a Synod was convoked to meet at Sens, in 1140. A large number of bishops and abbots, and King Louis VII., attended. At first the holy abbot of Clairvaux did not wish to be present, because it was improper, he said, to take up the consideration of opinions already condemned; but finally he yielded, lest the partisans of Abelard should boast that their leader's position was impregnable. When the Synod had met, certain extracts from Abelard's books were being read, when, to the surprise of all, the author arose, appealed to the judgment of the Roman Pontiff, and left the hall. Out of respect to the Holy See, the prelates then took no action in regard to the person of Abelard, but they condemned his errors, and sent a report of their proceedings to Pope Innocent II., beseeching him to repress the innovator's audacity. Samson of Rheims, Joscelin of Soissons, and other prelates now sent a letter to the Pontiff, the style of which plainly indicates that St. Bernard was its author. We give a part of it, because it shows the impression which Abelard had produced on men of undoubted zeal and learning. "Peter Abelard tries to nullify the merit of Christian faith, for he thinks that he can comprehend, with his human intelligence, all that God is. He ascends even unto heaven, and descends into the abysses; nothing is hid-

great doctor. Two medallions figured Abelard as a Cupid with curled moustache, and Heloise about as decent as a Messalina. In the sarcophagus you see two recumbent statues; one in clerical costume, and this is the Abelard so seductive above with flowing hair and moustache; the other is of a woman of the fourteenth century, and was originally on a tomb in the chapel of St. John of Beauvais, in Paris. How much this unknown lady has gained by her assumption of the name of Heloise! The grisettes bathe her with their tears, and bury her in crowns of *immortelles* for which they have paid ten cents at the gate; then the pitying creatures sit down, and read, as though they were prayers, two or three of the parodied letters of 'Loise and Bélard.'"

[1] Thus he thought the ideas of Plato concerning the divine goodness more elevated than those of Moses. "Dixit et Moyses omnia a Deo valde bona esse facta; sed plus aliquantulum laudis divinæ bonitati Plato assignare videtur." (*Theol.* p. x., 1207).

den from him, whether it be in heaven above or in the depths of hell. In his own eyes he is a great man, disputing *de fide* against the faith, dealing with things above himself, an inquirer into majesty, a fabricator of heresies. Some time ago he composed a book on the Holy Trinity, but as errors were found in it, it was given to the flames by order of the legate of the Roman Church. Accursed is he who rebuilds the ruins of Jericho. That book has arisen from the dead, and with it many dead heresies have arisen, and appeared to many. At last it extends its influence to the sea and pushes its way even in Rome, for this man boasts that his book is received in the Roman court. Hence his error is strengthened, and he confidently preaches the word of iniquity on all sides. And when, in the presence of the bishops, the abbot of Clairvaux, armed with the zeal of justice and of faith, would have pressed him concerning these things, Abelard neither avowed nor denied them; but, without any provocation, and merely that he might persist in his iniquity, he appealed from the day, place and judge he himself had chosen, unto the Apostolic See. . . . . We have proceeded in this affair so far as we dare; it is now for you, most blessed father, to provide that the beauty of the Church be not stained by any mark of heretical foulness."

In his own name, St. Bernard addressed two epistles to the Pontiff, and in the first (No. 189) we read: "Foolishly did I lately promise rest to myself, as though the fury of the lion had been appeased, and the Church would have peace. We have escaped a lion, but have encountered a dragon who is not less dangerous in ambush than the other roaring aloud. A new gospel and a new faith are proposed to the nations. Goliath advances his tall frame, equipped in all the panoply of war, and preceded by his squire, Arnold of Brescia. While attacking the doctors of the Church, he highly lauds the philosophers, preferring their inventions and his own novelties to the teaching of the Catholic fathers and the faith; and when all fly from before him, he selects me, the least of all, for single combat. At his request, the archbishop of Sens appointed a day for a meeting, in which Abelard would establish, if possible, the wicked doctrines against which I had presumed to murmur. I declined, both because I am a boy, while he is a warrior even from his youth, and because I judged it improper to submit to the agitation of petty human reason that faith which is surely founded on certain and enduring truth. . . . . For this reason he cried the louder, called many together. . . . . He declared everywhere that he would reply to me at Sens." St. Bernard also wrote concerning Abelard to all the Roman cardinals collectively, and especially to the cardinal Guido di Castello, who had been a disciple of the professor. In this latter letter he says:

"In his book, master Peter introduces profane novelties of speech and of meaning. He sees nothing as in a mirror and by enigma, but regards everything face to face. When he speaks of the Trinity, Arius seems to be talking; if he treats of grace, we hear Pelagius; and when he descants on the Person of Christ, he seems to be Nestorius." Writing to Cardinal Ivo, the saint thus depicts his adversary: "A monk under no rule, a prelate without charge, he neither holds any order nor is held by order. He is dissimilar to himself; within a Herod, without a John; he has nothing of a monk save name and dress. He is ignorant of nothing in heaven or on earth, excepting himself." If some of St. Bernard's expressions appear harsh, we must remember that he was defending the cause of truth, the interests of Catholic dogma, and therefore the interests of imperilled souls. In the mind and words of a true Catholic, there can be no compromise with heresy, and in dealing with Abelard, St. Bernard would have been foolish had he regarded him as an ignorant layman or a delicate school-girl under instruction. He was a "Goliath, equipped in all the panoply of war," and it was only the sharp pebble, sent straight at his brow, that was to bring him low. It is ridiculous for Mosheim to affect to believe that St. Bernard was jealous of Abelard. The saint was one of the last to enter the lists against the innovator, and it was principally because of the pressure brought to bear upon him by William, abbot of St. Thierry, that he moved in the matter. Before the Council of Sens he wrote amicably and urgently to Abelard, begging him to correct his books. Abelard, let us not forget, was also condemned at Rome, and are we to suppose that the Pontiff and cardinals were actuated by jealousy? Bernard was simply influenced by zeal for the truth, and the moment he found that his antagonist had retracted, he gave him a brother's hand, as we shall now see.

When Pope Innocent II. had received a report of the proceedings at Sens, he confirmed the condemnation of Abelard's errors, and enjoined perpetual silence on the master, "as upon a heretic." After departing from Sens, Abelard started for Rome, but hearkening to the fatherly voice of the venerable Peter of Cluny, he stopped in that monastery. Here he was reconciled to St. Bernard, as we are informed in the following letter, written by Peter to the Pontiff: "The master Peter, well known, as I believe, to your Wisdom, coming lately from France,[1] stopped at Cluny. We asked him whither he was journeying, and he replied that he was greatly vexed by certain parties who styled him a heretic, a name which he abhorred, and that he had appealed to the Apostolic Majesty. We applauded the design, and we advised him to fly to the

[1] Cluny was in Burgundy, which duchy was not joined to France until 1477.

acknowledged general refuge, telling him that the Apostolic justice, which had never failed a stranger, would not be refused to him. We promised that mercy, if reason there were for it, would be extended to him. In the meantime the lord abbot of the Cistercians arrived here, and he talked with Abelard and ourselves concerning peace between my lord of Clairvaux and the master. We also did all in our power toward a reconciliation, and we exhorted Abelard to accompany the Cistercian to Bernard, admonishing him to expunge from his books everything which might offend Catholic ears, as indeed Bernard and other good and wise men had already besought him to do. And this Abelard did, going and returning after having, through the mediation of the Cistercian, settled his olden differences with my lord of Clairvaux in a peaceful interview. Then, according to our advice, or rather, as we believe, inspired by God, he abandoned the tumults of the schools, and chose a permanent abode in your Cluny. Deeming this resolution fitting to his age, weakness, and piety, and feeling that his learning, not altogether unknown to you, would greatly advantage our community, we granted his request. Therefore, if it be agreeable to your Benignity, we graciously and joyfully allowed him to remain with us, your children; and hence I, whatever I may be, yet ever yours, do ask; and this convent of Cluny, most devoted to you, also asks; and he himself asks, by these letters which he has requested me to write, that you will order him to spend his remaining days, which perchance are few, in your Cluny; and that, through no influence, he be expelled or removed from the dwelling which, like a sparrow, he has found, or from the nest in which he, like a dove, rejoices, but that, as you ever cherish the good, and have loved even him, you will protect him with the Apostolic shield."

The reader may be interested by a brief summary of the errors of Abelard, as condensed from the accounts by St. Bernard,[1] by the abbot of St. Thierry,[2] and by Otho of Frisingen.[3] First, he placed degrees in the Trinity, "modes" in the majesty, and numbers in the eternity of God; the Father is full of power, the Son is a certain power, and the Holy Ghost no power; the Son is to the Father as a certain power is to power, as a species is to genus, as a man is to animal. Second, he asserted that the Holy Ghost proceeds indeed from the Father and the Son, but not from the *esse* of the Father, or from the substance of the Son. Third, he denied that the devil ever had any right in man, and that the Son became man to redeem us from the dominion of Satan; the Son became man merely to show His love for us. Fourth, the Holy Ghost is the

[1] *Epistle* 190 *to Innocent II.*
[2] *Dispute against Abelard.*
[3] *Deeds of Frederick I.*, book i., c. 47.

soul of the world. Fifth, Christ, God and Man, is not the second person of the Trinity. Sixth, we can wish and do good without the aid of grace. Seventh, in the Eucharist the form of the prior substance remains in the air. Eighth, the punishment, not the guilt, of original sin descends to us from Adam. Ninth, there is no sin unless the act be in contempt of God. Tenth, ignorance always excuses from sin. Eleventh, diabolical suggestions often come from physical impressions, contact, etc. Twelfth, faith is the acceptation of things not seen. Thirteenth, there are limits to the Divine omnipotence; God could do no more than He has done or will do. Fourteenth, Christ did not descend into Limbo. Fifteenth, the final judgment of men can be attributed also to the Father. Sixteenth, the power of binding and loosing is doubtful. Seventeenth, God never impedes evil, changing the will of man. Eighteenth, the executioners of our Lord did not sin. Nineteenth, the spirit of the fear of God was not in Christ, and in the next world there will be no chaste fear of God. Such were the propositions in reference to which St. Bernard wrote to the cardinals at Rome: "Read, if you please, the book of Peter Abelard, which he says to be on Theology. You have it at hand, for he boasts that many in the court read it. See what he therein says about the Trinity, about the generation of the Son, about the Procession of the Holy Ghost, and the innumerable things he has which are foreign to Catholic ears and minds. Read also the book entitled his *Sentences*, and the one with the title, *Know Thyself*, and observe how rank they are with the seeds of sacrilege and of error; see his opinions as to the Person and Soul of Christ, His descent into Limbo, the Sacrament of the Altar, the power of binding and loosing, original sin, concupiscence, the sin of delectation, the sins committed through infirmity or ignorance, the work of sin, and the will to sin. If, then, you find that I have reason to be agitated, do you also be moved, and not in vain, but act for the place you occupy, for your dignity, and for the power you have received."

In his *Apology*, or Confession of Faith, Abelard declared that these errors were all ascribed to him through ignorance or malice; and he denied that he ever wrote a book of *Sentences*. But if the reader will follow Alexandre, as he examines the above nineteen propositions, one by one, he will find that many of them were distinctly taught by Abelard, although, in some cases, St. Bernard and the abbot of St. Thierry did not correctly apprehend his meaning. As for Abelard's denial that he wrote a book of *Sentences*, he thereby descended to an unworthy and puerile equivocation, for, though the book may not have borne that title, he did not disclaim the authorship of the passages to which St. Bernard objected, and which are found in that book. One great fault

of Abelard was his proneness to the use of incongruous illustrations in explaining matters of faith. Otho of Frisingen gives one instance which will serve for many: "As the proposition, argument, and conclusion are one and the same oration, so the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are the same essence."

Subjoined to the works of Abelard is found an *Apology* for the great master, written by Berengarius of Poitiers, who had been one of his disciples. The work of a young and ardent man, carried away by enthusiastic admiration for his teacher, it is extremely contumelious toward St. Bernard. Berengarius asserts that the saint tried to discover occasion to rebuke Abelard, rather than to effect his conversion. But we are told by Godfrey, a disciple of Abelard, and secretary to the saint, in his *Life of St. Bernard*, that the holy abbot, "with his usual benignity, desiring to correct the error, not to confound the man, privately admonished him; and so modestly and reasonably did he proceed that Abelard was touched, and promised to correct all according to his wish. But the good design was abandoned." Berengarius also says that his master, "whose mouth was the storehouse of reason, the trumpet of faith, and the dwelling of the Trinity," was condemned at Sens while absent, and unheard. But Abelard was contumacious, and had declined a judgment previously invoked by himself. Berengarius also attacks many points of doctrine which he alleges to have been put forth by St. Bernard, but in each case he misinterprets the saint's meaning. In his more mature age, this enthusiastic defender of Abelard modified his views, condemned his master's errors, and acknowledged the abbot of Clairvaux as "the Martin of our day, a shining light."

Abelard has often been stigmatized as a heretic, but unjustly. He did not pertinaciously adhere to his theories, but ever professed himself ready to correct them if found erroneous; and, in fact, he did correct them. In the prologue to his *Introduction*, he plainly avows his willingness to accept correction, "by force of reason or by scriptural authority," and declares that he will imitate St. Augustine in his *Retractions*, so that, "if he cannot be free from the vice of ignorance, he at least may not incur the guilt of heresy, for while ignorance does not make a man a heretic, obstinate pride does so make one." In the *Profession of Faith*, which he sent to Heloise, he says: "I wish not to so be a philosopher as to resist Paul; to so be an Aristotle as to be separated from Christ. There is no other name than His by which I can be saved. . . . . And in order that trembling anxiety and all doubt may be removed from your heart, you may be sure of this, in my regard, that I have founded my conscience upon that rock on which Christ built His Church. . . . . I believe that the Son is co-equal to the Father in

all things, in eternity, power, will, and deed; nor do I hearken to Arius, who, moved by his perverse genius, yea, seduced by a demon, placed degrees in the Trinity, teaching that the Father is greater and the Son less. . . . . I declare that the Holy Ghost is consubstantial and co-equal to the Father and the Son in all things. . . . . I assert that in Baptism all sin is remitted; that we need grace, both to commence good and to go on with it. . . . . As for the resurrection of the body, why should I refer to it, when I would uselessly glory in being a Christian if I did not believe I would arise from the tomb?" And in the last of his works, the *Apology*, dedicated "To all the Children of Holy Church," he wrote: "Well known is the saying that nothing can be so accurately expressed that it cannot be distorted; and St. Jerome well observes that the author of many books creates many critics. And I, who have produced only a few little books, and those, if compared with others, of small importance, have not succeeded in avoiding censure; although, as to the things of which I have been accused, I acknowledge, God knows, no fault of my own. If there were any such fault I would not obstinately defend it. I may have written some things which had better remained unpublished, but I protest before God, the judge of my soul, that in such matters I presumed nothing in malice or in pride. I have taught a long time and in many schools, and my doctrine has never been a sluggish stream or a hidden loaf. I have plainly declared what I deemed conducive to a proper presentation of the faith and of morals, and all my writings have been offered to judges rather than to disciples. I may have exceeded in my plethora of speech, for it is written that 'by much talking thou shalt not avoid sin,' but obstinate resistance has never made me a heretic, for I have always been ready to give satisfaction, either by destroying or by correcting all wrong utterances, and in that mind I shall persevere to the end. . . . . Therefore, whatsoever I may be, let fraternal charity recognize me as a child of the Church; as one who receives all that she receives, who rejects all that she rejects; as one who, although inferior to others in virtue, has never impaired the unity of faith." And then Abelard expressly professes the Catholic doctrines which are contrary to all his own errors, or to those imputed to him.

PROF. MAX MÜLLER ON LANGUAGE AND THOUGHT.

IT is a principle often attributed to Aristotle, that one must be a god or a beast to be able to live without social intercourse. Without it, man is shut up in himself, a riddle to his neighbor and himself. Language alone raises the blinds and admits light into the abysses of the human soul; it alone reveals whether the heart is a "fountain sealed up," "a garden inclosed" or a slumbering volcano. From our earliest childhood to the silence of the grave, in joy and in sadness, amidst the pleasures of life and its severest duties, language is our constant friend and attendant. The pulpit and the platform, the novel and the imitation of Christ, the whole domain of science and the vast fields of literature are alike indebted to language. Its absence is worse than death—it is a living death. Solitary confinement leads, with but few exceptions, to mental derangement, and the cloister of the silent Trappists becomes bearable only for the love of Christ. It is not surprising, then, if the connection of language and thought has been always considered an interesting topic of study; and it is still less astonishing if publications of Prof. Max Müller on this subject have elicited an uncommon amount of scientific interest. Hardly had "The Science of Thought"[1] appeared when as many as fourteen or fifteen different letters were printed in *Nature*, some in favor of the aged orientalist's theory, some opposed to it, but all alike recognizing the importance and paramount interest of the subject. The book was styled "the most important contribution to English philosophic literature since Mill's examination of the philosophy of Sir William Hamilton,"[2] and at the same time the theory was represented as violent, exaggerated and impossible,[3] as "a mere philological mare's nest," "a paradox."[4] In spite of all this, the theory hardly deserves the name of novelty; it is difficult, indeed, even for a thinker of Max Müller's metal to propose a theory concerning the origin and nature of human thought that has not been clearly formulated before or is not, at least implicitly, contained in previous systems.

The theory of "The Science of Thought" has been rightly reduced to three principles by an able critic:[5] 1. Language and thought are identical and inseparable. 2. The history of language is the history of thought, so that the human mind must be studied in language and its facts. 3. The analysis of all words would solve all questions of philosophy. The first principle is, of course,

[1] 1887, Ch. Scribners' Sons, New York.
[2] *The Dial*, 1887, p. 122.
[3] *Contemporary Review*, December, 1888, p. 824.
[4] *Ibid*, October, 1888, p. 475.
[5] *The Dial*, 1887, p. 123.

fundamental in the theory of Prof. Müller; with the identity or inseparableness of thought and language stand or fall the second and third propositions. All the critics recognize this by the fact that they pay serious attention to this point alone; and the author himself lays in the end all stress on the same thesis. An article written by him in self-defense[1] is entitled, "No Language Without Reason, No Reason Without Language." In "The Science of Thought" itself this is the only principle that has been fully developed and systematized, the other principles being considered as corollaries. Our whole knowledge is portioned off into four pigeon holes: sensations, percepts, concepts, names. Sensation is nothing but the reaction of a self-conscious monon under the active influence of something external. By a process of subjective evolution our sensations develop into percepts or presentations, and these again into concepts and names. Names are, however, admitted to be conventional signs. Though no theory concerning the origin of names is given as certain, still we clearly understand that Prof. Noiré's system has found special favor in the eyes of his friend, Max Müller. In fact, it is principally owing to the linguistic work of the latter that the system has attained to anything like internal probability. All language is reduced by him to about one hundred and twenty-one roots, all of which denote originally action and owe their existence to the "clamor concomitans." The latter is explained in the following way: When men exert themselves, their nerves and muscles naturally contract or expand and communicate this same agitated state to other parts of the body which cannot find immediate relief by the resistance of the work itself. Thus, certain actions always affect the nerves of the tongue and the whole speaking apparatus in a certain way; these seek relief by giving vent to certain sounds, varying according to the stress of the vocal chords. Hence arises the "clamor concomitans," which after a while develops into a "clamor significans." The needs of primitive man being few and simple, his actions too were contained within the limit of one hundred and twenty-one varieties, and to these correspond the one hundred and twenty-one roots to which the whole of language is reduced. So much for the general features of Noiré's theory as adopted by Prof. Müller.

To do justice to Prof. Max Müller's theory we shall first consider the limitations with which it is proposed, then proceed to examine it, not according to the value of the arguments brought forward in its favor, but according to its own intrinsic merit. We do not consider arguments as so many useless darts of idle controversy; but even great men may, at times, defend a good cause by

[1] *Nature*, July, 1887, p. 249.

bad arguments, and not rarely has a light-armed dialectician defended a falsehood by specious reasoning.

The preface of "The Science of Thought" invites, however, a few preliminary remarks. The author has, of course, a right to a father's tenderness for his offspring, and rightly begs that the book may not be tested "by mere shibboleths or condemned by being called names"; but he ought to remember all the mischief he has done by hall-marking the bow-wow theory. Again, the preface leads us to expect something entirely new, while the book overwhelms us with a shower of quotations from various authors, ranging from Abelard to Mill and Schopenhauer, showing that all of these thinkers held the author's theory, to a certain extent, at least. One more instance of Prof. Müller's inconsistency: On page 5 of his "Science of Thought" Mr. Mill is blamed for his inconsistency of reasoning from the sagacity of animals, while he confesses: "I do not know what passes in a mole's mind." Now, in *Nature*[1] the Professor himself says: "I prefer, indeed, as I have often said, to remain a perfect agnostic with regard to the inner life of animals"; but elsewhere he, too, is inclined to give the animal mind the preference over the human understanding.

In the investigation of the exact position of Prof. Müller with regard to the relation of language to thought, it will be most conducive to clearness to hear first the doubts and objections of his opponents. But here, again, we must distinguish between the opponents who deny the Professor's premises and those who deny his inference; the former oppose him on metaphysical, the latter on logical, grounds. Against the proposition, "No thought without language," Mr. F. Galton[2] objected that a single instance to the contrary sufficed to render that thesis untenable, and such an instance he presented in his own person. He attests that he can think without words in mechanics, at billiards, when fencing, when crossing a river by jumping from stone to stone, and even in algebra and geometry. The Duke of Argyll calls attention to the fact that parrots have often a highly-developed faculty of articulation without being on that account more clever than other birds.[3] Mr. Hyde Clarke[4] refers to the mutes of the seraglio at Constantinople, who lead an intellectual life and take interest in politics, though they are deprived of language. Mr. T. Mellard Reade[5] attests that he is able to think without words in matters of geology and mechanics. Mr. Harold Picton[6] appeals to the frequent occurrence when we have a word "on the tip of the tongue," but cannot express the idea we possess so clearly and distinctly.

---

[1] July, 14, 1887, p. 250.
[2] *Nature*, May 12, 1887, p. 28.
[3] *Nature*, May 19, 1887, p. 52.
[4] *Ibid.*
[5] *Ibid.*
[6] *Nature*, June 9, 1887, p. 125.

To answer all these facts Prof. Müller has recourse to definitions;[1] he denies that mechanics, fencing, and billiards fall under the definition of thought. Chess, he admits, would fall under it. In algebra, he says, we inhibit language rather than dispense with it. When we must look for a word to express ourselves, we have not yet a clear thought; as soon as our thought passes from the general to the individual, our words, too, change from "thing," "chose," "man," to "steam-engine," "carbonic acid," "lieutenant of the second fusilier regiment." Monkeys, dogs, and deaf-mutes may, indeed, be taught dominoes; but left to themselves, they cannot invent it. In the case of deaf-mutes the Professor seems to lose his ordinary kindly disposition; he professes himself an agnostic with regard to their inner life as much as with regard to the inner life of animals. Surely, logic makes tyrants of us all—Mr. George J. Romanes[2] infers from the answer of Max Müller that thought once attained may continue without words. Aphasia, he says, proves that this is no mere conjecture. Consequently, the absolute dependence of thought on language asserted in "The Science of Thought,"[3] must be denied. Mr. Joseph J. Murphy[4] thinks the independence of thought on language in a few particular cases of little practical importance, nay, he maintains that such an independence must be admitted in the investigation of things falling under the senses. He implies, nevertheless, that language is necessary for the training of the mind. Prof. Müller in a later article[5] made these statements his own.

Next we give a summary of Prof. Max Müller's opponents on logical grounds. Mr. Ebbels[6] finds fault with the definition of language given in "The Science of Thought." It is all very well to speak of "thought-words" and "word-thoughts" as constituting language; but, as a matter of fact, it is not only in them that we think, but also in pictures. Besides, to deny that our mental operations become real thought until they become "addition and subtraction," is to reduce the whole question to a quarrel of words. Mr. Arthur Nicols[7] attacks the proposed system on logical grounds, too. He brings together the two following propositions of the Professor: "Of course we all admit that without a name we cannot really know anything," and "one fact remains, animals have no language." The inference flowing from these premises goes entirely against Prof. Müller's philosophical tenets in matters of animal intelligence. The Duke of Argyll, too, is a powerful

---

[1] *Nature*, June 2, 1887, p. 100 f. and July 14, 1887, p. 249 ff.
[2] *Nature*, June 23, 1887, p. 171 ff.
[3] Pp. 63 and 64.
[4] *Nature*, *ibid.*
[5] *Nature*, July 14, 1887, p. 249 ff.
[6] *Nature*, June 23, 1887, p. 172.
[7] *Ibid.*

opponent of the new system from a logical standpoint.[1] The Professor's definition of language is called in question by him, because in its compass nothing can be acknowledged as language that is not locally identified with thought. English, spoken to a Chinaman, ceases to be language. Then His Grace appeals to the division of human knowledge into sensations, percepts and concepts; for every concept implies abstraction and therefore subtraction, though not every concept is admitted by Max Müller to the dignity of thought. Again, in "The Science of Thought" it is understood that we may have sensations and percepts without words; but, on the other hand, it is denied that we can have sensations and percepts without thought. Hence we can have thought without words.

After listening to the arguments of Prof. Müller's opponents we are better able to understand the various positions he himself has taken at different periods with regard to the identity of thought and language. The limitations and qualifications he has added to his theory will appear clearest by considering the definitions of language and thought he has successively given and the various kinds of necessary connection he has tried to establish between these two terms, and also the principal analogies by which he has explained and beautified his favorite theory. First, then, must be considered the successive definitions of language. In the beginning, no doubt, Prof. Müller meant by language what he analyzed as language, namely, the resultant final compound of those elements to which he himself had reduced language. Now, this is nothing else but significant articulate sound, either pronounced or expressed in writing or conceived in thought. But when the deaf-mutes loom up before the mental eye of the Professor, he finds it convenient to widen his range of language, comprising now all signs of communication, whether sounds or gestures. The hand as a possible sign for five, hands and feet as signs for twenty, serve as illustrations of such wordless thoughts. Such signs, we are told, are rather the signs of signs than the signs of concepts, and, in the end, we always return from the *notà notæ* to what is denoted by the first *nota* or sign. How deaf-mutes do this, we are not informed. But even thus modified, did language not fit into Max Müller's system. He advanced, therefore, boldly a step farther, carrying the domain of language into the realm of mind. Language consists of names, and a name is that by which a thing becomes known (notum).[2] Language and thought are then but two different names for the same thing, or at most they are two different views of the

---

[1] *Contemporary Review*, December, 1888, p. 806 ff.

[2] *Nature*, June 2, 1887, p. 101.

same object, much like the two sides of a medal. Well might Mr. Shorey, in his review of "The Science of Thought," say that the author's hand had lost none of its old cunning.[1] And as if this identity of thought and language were not yet sufficient to satisfy the pride of any linguist, the Professor advanced another step. In "The Science of Thought" we are told "a name is nothing if it is not the name of a thing, and a thing is nothing if it is not the thing of a name."[2] After such a statement the author need not be afraid of being called a nominalist; he is rather a realist of the most advanced kind. The necromancer of the Middle Ages would have seen in this theory a scientific basis for his art, and through its magic spell would have exercised his power over everything namable in heaven, on earth, and under the earth.

If the linguist thus widens the limits of language at pleasure, he is not afraid either of narrowing the definition of thought. At first, thought is defined in the words of Hobbes as "addition and subtraction." Brevity of definition is no doubt convenient in argument, but truth is more satisfactory in the end; not that the definition given by Prof. Müller is not true so far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. In mathematics it is very well to reduce all operations to addition and subtraction as the foundation, because in mathematics everybody knows quantities are to be added or subtracted. But in the realm of thought Prof. Max Müller himself admits four factors: sensations, percepts, concepts, and names. Which of these have to be added and subtracted to generate thought? Perhaps the mere addition or subtraction of none of them would present thought according to the author's mind; subtraction he may take as abstraction, addition as generalization. But then, again, every concept would be thought, which the Professor does not admit. Nor does he wish to have "thought" applied to sentences or clauses alone, because he maintains that some words are thought. The word "dog" is thus elevated to the dignity of thought as we see from a practical argument for the new theory; for this word serves as an illustration that there is no thought without words. The title of one of Max Müller's articles in *Nature*[3] bears witness that he found it convenient later to restrict the meaning of thought to reason; the title reads: "No Reason Without Language. . . . ." To prevent all misunderstanding in this matter, we must have recourse to another explanation given by the author himself:[4] "Thinking has been used by Descartes and other philosophers in a much wider sense also, so as to include sensation, passions, and *intuitive judgments*, which clearly

[1] *The Dial*, October, 1888, p. 121.
[2] P. 34.
[3] July 14, 1887, p. 249.
[4] *Nature*, June 2, 1887, p. 100.

require no words for their realization." But are not intuitive judgments an "addition or subtraction"? Or if they are excluded from the grade of "thought," notwithstanding, concepts, too, ought to be excluded from it, since intuitive judgments consist of concepts and something besides.

Finally, the kind of connection existing between thought and language must be considered, taking language in its conveniently widened, and thought in its unduly restricted, sense. The very title of the first publication, "The Science of Thought," gives us a clue to the author's opinion on the subject. For if the science of language is the science of thought, practically language must be identical with thought, an inference that may be proved correct by reference to almost any page of the book. And far from retracting his opinion, the Professor seems to hold it more firmly as time goes on. In the *Contemporary Review*[1] he again insists: "If we distinguish at all between concepts and words, we are bound to say that concepts are due to words, ... and not, as most philosophers will have it, that words are due to concepts"; and again, in the same article, "our whole mental property consists in names." But at times the Orientalist seems to have wavered in his position. In *Nature*[2] he thinks that the Duke of Argyll has conceded his whole thesis in the concession that language seems to be necessary to *the progress* of thought, but not at all necessary for the mere act of thinking. And in the same article[3] we read: "Mr. Murphy is one of those who agree with me that language is necessary to thought, and that, though it may be possible to think without words, when the subjects of thought are visible things and their combinations, as in inventing machinery, the intellectual power that invents machinery has been matured by the use of language."

We see clearly from this investigation that the new theory has not yet crystallized in the inventor's mind. He wavers in his definition of language; he shifts his ground in the definition of thought; he doubts with regard to the kind of nexus existing between those two unknown quantities; in other words, he knows not whether x is equal to y or greater or smaller than y. But the "cunning hand" of the experienced author knows how to conceal this state of unpleasant doubt by giving us a great deal of irrelevant delightful chit-chat, *de omni re scibili et de quibusdam aliis*, and also by using several very plausible analogies. We learn that Müller's "Waldmann," the father of the late Matthew Arnold's "Geist," still flourishes in his green old age. Besides Darwinism and Mill's "Logic," Schopenhauer and Panini's "Grammar," the Vedas and Max Müller's honorable position in English society, Sanskrit roots

[1] October, 1888, p. 485. [2] July 14, 1887, p. 249. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 250.

and Kant's "Philosophy" form as many rich sources for amusing detail. Then we are informed that language is to thought what anatomy is to biology. Now, suppose a text-book entitled "The Science of Biology" should tell us that biology is nothing but a vital addition and subtraction of organic elements, that all of these may be classified under the headings flesh, bone, and muscle, or more scientifically under the sixty-five elements of chemistry, which are subject to certain properties representable by circles and spheres, so that if the same sphere can hold two or more elements entirely or partially, those two or more elements form an organic cell fit to enter as integral part into a living body. Suppose, finally, that same text-book should venture to enunciate the thesis, "anatomy and biology are identical," Prof. Müller himself would be the first to denounce the book, because it confuses terms and sciences, and while trying to simplify knowledge points back to the infancy of surgery as to the great ideal of biological study. It is surprising that Prof. Müller has not perceived that he has dealt in the same way with the science of the mind. Prehistoric savages might be pardoned for confusing language with thought; but in the light of modern science such mistakes should not happen even with a biassed specialist. The sophistry of another analogy has been pointed out in the *Contemporary Review*,[1] and needs therefore only to be mentioned. Max Müller has said: "We can distinguish between the sound and the meaning of a word just as we can distinguish between the pitch and the timbre of our voice." This either contradicts the author's own position or it means nothing at all. For the pitch and timbre of our voice are the natural constituent elements of the same; the pitch might indeed be present without the accompanying harmonics, but then the identity of the voice would be destroyed. While in matters of language the Professor himself declares that the meaning of a word is not a natural constituent part of the same, he maintains, on the contrary, that it is arbitrary. It would have been more correct to say: We may distinguish between the sound and the meaning of a word just as we may distinguish between the African lion and our association of it with Great Britain.

Prof. Max Müller's gossip has been mentioned above; but we must also consider his more weighty vagaries, since they are apt to prepossess a conservative reader in the author's favor. Whatever clever arguments the Professor may bring up to the contrary, the connection of thought and language or their separability has nothing to do with the descent of man. Man is a son of Adam, even if the wild duck can warn its young ones of approaching

[1] December, 1888, p. 809.

danger by a sharp "quack," and even if the huntsman can know that he is discovered by the voice of the shy animal he pursues. The tender cry of the female mammal has as little influence on man's descent as the fact that the ox knoweth his owner and the ass his master's crib. Nor have materialism and spiritism more to fear from Darwin's "dangerous man" than Darwin's theory of evolution. The inseparableness of thought and language no more obliges us to use "matter" in the objective case only and "spirit" in the nominative, than his abundance of wine obliges the Italian or Frenchman to use wine for drinking only, water for washing. It is, indeed, a spirit alone, or a spiritual substance, that can really think; but it is not matter alone that we can think of. The etymology of the word matter is of no value here; the present usage of the word makes it signify an extended and resistant subject, a substance that can be made the bearer of material energy. The Duke of Argyll rightly warns Max Müller to beware of "back-tracks." These may present a great many interesting facts when the history of a word is in question, or when we deal in a dead language with a word that occurs only once in the whole literature of that language. But to learn the right usage of a word in any living language, we apply for information to our standard writers and speakers rather than to Prof. Müller's "back-tracks."

In "The Science of Thought," as well as in his letters, Prof. Müller repeatedly complains of the neglect of Kant in our days; he is surprised how any one can claim to deal in philosophic thought without having read the works of that illustrious thinker. On the present subject the old scholastic philosophy would have served the Professor better than Kant's "Critic of Pure Reason" has done. The tenets held by the scholastics in this matter are clearer and better defined than any thesis formulated by Kant or his school. First we are told: Thought is impossible without a mental word (*verbum mentale*), at least in our present state of existence.[1] About the vision of God and the knowledge of pure spirits after the soul has been separated from the body we need not speak here, since at present all our knowledge is had through the senses, as will be shown in the next paragraph. Nor is there need to develop the various opinions of the scholastic philosophers concerning the mental word. It suffices to state in general that when the object of knowledge is not physically present in the intellect, it must, in order to be known, be united to the intellect by means of its picture. Or, to present the same in another way, our intellect knowing an object differs from our intellect not knowing that object, and this difference has its foundation in the physical state of

[1] S. Thom., Summa c. gent. l.; c. 53; l. 4 c. 11.

the intellect itself. Now, the physical something which has modified our intellect in the act of cognition may be called the *verbum mentale*. Whether thought consists in this mental word, or in the action producing it, or in its union with the intellect, or in both the mental word and its productive action taken together, or in any other quality, action or passion connected with the same, does not affect the truth of our thesis that in our present state of existence thought is impossible without a mental word.

We have noticed, of course, that the "mental word" of the last paragraph differs widely from Prof. Max Müller's "thought-word." It differs, also, widely from the *verbum mentale* of G. J. Romanes,[1] who seems to express nothing by that term but a spoken word rehearsed within the recesses of our memory. But the second step of scholastic philosophy in this subject approaches nearer to the level of Prof. Max Müller and his critics. The scholastic thesis may be worded: While the soul is united to the body, our intellect depends on our imagination, not, indeed, in its being and action, but in the subject-matter of its action. Max Müller also admits this; worded in his language, it reads: "Percepts produce concepts," or, better, "no concept is without its corresponding percept." Hence the old axiom, *nihil est in intellectu quod prius non fuerit in sensu.*[2] But the schoolmen did not stop here; they further ask whether a thought once had may be rehearsed independently of the imagination. And this, too, is commonly answered in the negative. The facts alleged as proofs seem to raise this opinion to the certainty of a thesis. For, in the first place, experience teaches that our intellectual operations cease with the working of our imagination. Thus, when fast asleep, or when afflicted with brain disease, our intellectual faculties are at rest. Again, even purely spiritual objects, such as God and His angels, virtue and vice, and the like, cannot be thought of without an accompanying picture in the imagination, a "percept," to use Prof. Müller's language.

The schoolmen have, in the third place, explored Prof. Müller's own field. To do this thoroughly they asked themselves two questions: 1. Is there a connection between language and thought, language being taken in the sense of sound-language, though the sense of sign language is not entirely excluded? 2. In case such a connection exists, is it based on an absolute necessity of language to thought, or on mere utility? All scholastic philosophers answer the first question in the affirmative;[3] for the dependence of the

[1] *Nature*, June, 23, 1887, p. 172.

[2] Cf. S. Thom., *Summ. Theol.* I. q. 84 a 7; a, 8 ad 1; q. 89, a 1; q. 85 a 1; q. 87, a 3 ad 1; *de memor. et remin. lect.* 1. *Quaest. disput.* q. 2, *de verit.* a 6; q. 10 *de verit.* a, 6, ad 2.

[3] Cf. S. Thom. *Summ. Theol.*, 2 a, 6 c, 10; 2 a 2 æ, q. 55, a 4 ad 2; q. 72, a 1 c 2, 110, a 1 ad—S. Aug. *De doct. Chrst*, l. 2 c. 3 circ med.

intellect on the imagination for its thought material being once admitted, thought is naturally connected with the pictures of the imagination; now, language presents in its various words shorter and clearer and more definite pictures or "percepts" than we can expect to attain in any other way. Hence, whatever substitutes for language may be devised by our modern educators of youth, whether pictures or objects, or abstruse mathematics, language will triumph in the end. Other percepts may be found easier and more satisfactory up to a certain point, but they will never be found in sufficient number and clearness for the purposes of practical life; indeed, any percept fountain besides language will, in our social life, often prove a hindrance rather than a help.

The second question concerning the *kind* of connection between language and thought is variously answered by the schoolmen, and here especially might Prof. Müller have profited by giving a few hours to the reading of scholastic philosophy. He would have found that the school of traditionalism—a recent opponent of scholasticism—pretty nearly held the same tenets which he himself expressed in "The Science of Thought." De Bonald (1754–1840)[1] and H. F. R. de Lamennais (1782–1854)[2] proposed their doctrine in the following way: 1. As vision is impossible without light, so thought is impossible without language. 2. Man could never have attained to either language or thought through his own strength, hence divine revelation was necessary. 3. God gave thought to man by giving a ready-made language to primitive man. 4. All the descendants of Adam acquire thought only through education and language. Those two thinkers were not afraid of what Prof. Max Müller would call a miracle. They perceived that their system could not be defended without it, and so their followers knew what to defend and their opponents what to attack.

The system of Traditionalism was proposed by Bonnetty[3] and Ventura[4] in a somewhat different form. Bonnetty holds: 1. Language, and consequently primitive revelation, is absolutely necessary to the knowledge of metaphysical, moral, and religious truths. 2. Other thoughts we may acquire without the aid of revelation, as well as rehearse without the help of language any thought once had. Ventura requires language and primitive revelation as absolutely necessary to a clear and distinct thought of God, spirit, soul, immor-

---

[1] *Recherches philos. sur les premiers objects des connaissances morales*, c. 2, t. i., p. 145. *Essais sur les lois naturelles de l'ordre social*, p. 49–111. *Legislation primitive*, t. i., p. 74–334.

[2] *Essai sur l'indifférence en matière de religion*, t. 2.

[3] *Annales de phil. chrét.*, ser. 4, t. 7, p. 63, 64, 67, and t. 8, p. 374.

[4] *La tradizione, e i Semipelagiani della Filosofia*, c. 1, § 6, p. 23; ff. and c. 6, § 204, ff.

tality, moral duty, and such like objects, while the thoughts, "being," "cause and effect," "good and evil," may be had without revelation. For us Catholics it is important to know that by a decree of the Sacred Congregation of the Index, given June 11, 1855, and approved by His Holiness Pope Pius IX., June 15 of the same year, the following propositions were presented to Bonnetty for subscription: 1. Reason can prove the existence of God, the spirituality of the soul, the liberty of man, to a certainty. Faith comes after revelation, and can therefore not be used conveniently to prove the existence of God to an atheist, or the spirituality and liberty of the soul to a naturalist and fatalist. 2. The use of reason precedes faith, and leads man to faith by the help of revelation and grace. 3. The method followed by St. Thomas, St. Bonaventure, and other later scholastics does not lead to rationalism. . . .[1] Bautain had subscribed to the first and second of these propositions as early as 1840. To prevent all misunderstanding, it must be stated that we do not intend to question the claim of Max Müller to the theory contained in "The Science of Thought," but to show that the same order of thoughts had held the attention of eminent thinkers long before the rise of the present controversy.

But traditionalism has not fully disappeared yet. The followers of the above-named leaders grant that without language we can have a confused and vague knowledge of metaphysical, moral, and religious truths. They grant, in the second place, that after the native crude powers of human understanding are developed, man may, without the aid of revelation, acquire the other natural truths; but for the development of his understanding, and for a clear and distinct knowledge of metaphysical, moral, and religious truth, man depends on language and revelation; not indeed as on the efficient cause of such development and knowledge, but as on an absolutely necessary condition. Against the theory thus worded we possess no positive ecclesiastical document, but reason rebels against such arbitrary limitations of its domain. The very nature of language, a complex of arbitrary signs as it is, prevents words from occupying such a high position in the world of thought. The stars and stripes of the American flag will never excite in the mind of the savage New Zealander the idea of the United States of North America either as cause or as necessary condition. A series of unpleasant experiences has to teach the barbarian first that there is something more in the flag than canvas and dye.

Barring the limits of necessity in this question of the connection of language and thought, scholastic philosophy is prepared to concede to Prof. Max Müller any amount of utility the professor

[1] *Denzinger Enchiridion*, n. n., 1506, 1507, 1508.

himself may wish to ascribe to language in the field of mental labor. The old saying of Lord Bacon that reading makes a full man, writing an exact man, and speaking a ready man, summarizes the beneficial effects of language on thought in an admirable manner. Language presents the mind with suitable food, stimulates its appetite, and regulates its digestion. Hence the importance of a due proportion between reading, writing, and speaking. Any one of these functions practised to excess, the mental state of man will show its bad effect. Man becomes either a mental glutton or an empty gossip, or a narrow pedant. Prof. Max Müller would no doubt confer a benefit on the rising generation and on posterity were he to employ the power of his pen in the question discussed at present in books and periodicals, how to educate our youth. With his enthusiasm for language and its necessity to thought, he might do a great deal to save the living generation from unintentionally dwarfing the minds of its young ones and posterity from a generation of mental monstrosities, "ever learning and never attaining to the knowledge of truth."

NOTE.—Since this article was written, a reply of Prof. Max Müller to his Grace, the Duke of Argyll, has appeared in the March number of the *Nineteenth Century*. With regard to the Professor's arguments, nothing has been changed in his last production; his thesis still reads as presented in this article: $x = > < y$. Prof. Noiré, whom in March Prof. Müller numbered among the living with M. Taine, Prof. Jewett and Sir James Stephen, has since then passed to his eternal reward.

THE CHURCH OF THE ATTAKAPAS—1750–1889.

I.

ABOUT 6 A.M., August 16, 1887, Père Jan, Pastor of St. Martinsville, La., was found dead in his poor, dusty room. He had retired at 9 the previous night to pray rather than to rest, though a man far up in the eighties might well have been weary after so full a day. He had celebrated two Masses and preached at each, heard many confessions, given Holy Communion to the greater number of his congregation, presided at Vespers, and held the Blessed Sacrament aloft over his people, for the last time, in solemn benediction. He lay against the bed partially kneeling—had not even undressed. The peaceful, smiling expression of his venerable countenance showed that the beautiful soul had departed without a struggle. The doctor declared he must have died some seven hours previous. So the Blessed Virgin had taken him on her greatest feast.

His death was telegraphed to New Orleans, and people asked each other: "Who is this Père Jan?" Save a few of the clergy, nobody seemed to know or care. He had lived between the porch and the altar; had never been in the city save in passing on his arrival in this country, thirty-seven years previous. To his simple flock he was all the world, but otherwise his life was as solitary as if he had lived in the Thebaid.

Yet the old priest that lay dead in St. Martinsville had seen stirring times. He had lived through the latter years of the first French Republic; remembered the fleeting glory of the great Napoleon's empire; shared the anxiety of the Hundred Days; and rejoiced, like a loyal Breton as he was, at the restoration of the Bourbons and monarchy.

Ordained May 26, 1826, by Archbishop de Quêlen, at Notre Dame, with sixty others, among whom was Archbishop Purcell, of Cincinnati, he said his first Mass on Trinity Sunday at the Convent des Carmes, memorable as the scene of the massacre of so many priests in 1792. The Abbé Surrat, his intimate friend who attended him, lived to witness scenes scarcely less horrible than those of '92, and became the victim of another massacre, second in atrocity only to that of the *Carmes*, when he was assassinated by the Communists in the fair city by the Seine forty-five years later.

On the return of Charles X. from Rheims, Père Jan acted as chief of the *mâitres de cérémonies* at the grand *Te Deum* at Notre Dame. Often did the simple priest in far-away St. Martinsville smile to think that he, on so great an occasion, had given the order

laisser passer to so many distinguished personages, among others his friend, Mgr. de Frayssinous, Minister of Public Instruction. A few years later he saw the flight of the same Charles, that typical Bourbon who could neither learn nor forget.

He had been the friend or fellow-student of nearly all the great churchmen of the Paris of his day, and among them all loved Lacordaire best.

It was the apostolic life of this holy priest that first drew the attention of the writer to the remote region blessed and sanctified by his labors. We shall return to this latest and greatest Apostle of the Attakapas.

II.

South Carolina is divided into districts, Louisiana into parishes; the divisions of the other States are counties. Five Louisiana parishes cover the ancient Attakapas country: St. Martin, St. Mary, Iberia, Lafayette, and Vermillion, lying between the Mississippi and the Mexican Gulf. Ecclesiastically, the Attakapas region once formed but a single parish, extending from Grand Coteau to Berwick Bay, and from the Atchafalaya to the Gulf of Mexico, an area of some thousands of square miles. A commandant ruled this fair country, politically known as the "Poste des Attakapas."

Into these green savannahs white men found their way very early. The first permanent settlers were a few families driven from Canada by the English. Their descendants are scattered over the wilds of Louisiana to-day. Some settled at the "Poste des Attakapas," as the Broussards, Martins, Le Blancs, Voorhies, Arcenaux, still numerously represented in St. Martinsville and its vicinity. Some New Orleans men, more adventurous than their brethren, "prospected" in these prairies, and a few settled down, "the world forgetting and by the world forgot," with Indian brides, whose dark eyes and swarthy complexions may be traced in their descendants to-day. The traditions of the country assert that the first of these migrations occurred between 1750 and 1760, during the administration of the Marquis de Vandreuil and Governor Kerlerec.

The immense plains, stretching to the Gulf, afforded such facilities for raising cattle that the immigrants chose a pastoral rather than an agricultural life. Bayous of pure, limpid water furnished delicious fish, and game was abundant. Much of their time was therefore spent in hunting and fishing. But the extraordinary richness of the soil, which yields several crops a year, did not long remain undiscovered. Indigo, cotton, rice, and tobacco soon varied the green monotony of these fertile pampas. Sugar-cane was introduced by the Jesuits in 1751, and seed-cane distributed throughout the various plantations. This made a great addition to home

comfort. But in 1795 sugar became a gold mine to Louisiana, when the syrup the cane yields was made to granulate on Boré's plantation near New Orleans.[1] This was a boon to the dwellers in the Attakapas. Nowhere are there finer sugar plantations than on the banks of the Tèche.

The first pale faces who arrived here found Attakapas Indians scattered throughout the territory. They had given up the man-eating propensities from which they took their name, and tradition assures us that there were among them many Christians.

By an arrangement, the wisdom of which has been often questioned, the Capuchins of the Province of Champagne attended to the spiritual wants of New Orleans, while the Jesuits preached the Gospel to the outlying Indian tribes. So, when the adventurous Canadians pushed westward to the Tèche country, they found the Indians partially Christianized and civilized. We know the name of but one Jesuit who preached to them in their native wilds, and that belongs to a later period—Father Viel,[2] who, besides his ministrations to them, taught a small school for the children of the dwellers in this romantic region.

III.

Even in the days of Bienville, who left America forever in 1747, the Attakapas and the pale faces had met. The romantic story of Belle-Isle is repeated to-day under the spreading oaks that fringe the sparkling bayous, and by the hunters and fishers of the Salt Marsh Parishes. In 1719 he sailed from France with many troops and emigrants. Losing their reckoning in a storm, they made land at St. Bernard's Bay, Texas. The captain sent ashore for fresh water. Belle-Isle and four other officers remained on land when the boat went back with her casks replenished. While awaiting their return for a second cargo the loiterers found so much to interest them that

---

[1] Etienne de Boré, a wealthy, influential planter, signalized himself by his humanity and charity to the Jesuits when they were suppressed in Louisiana in 1763. It was he who gave a home to the venerable Father Baudouin, S. J., a Canadian, whose health was irretrievably broken by his labors and sufferings among the Indians. He would not allow the holy missionary to be driven, at the age of seventy-two, from the country in which the greater part of his life had been spent. Mr. de Boré was grandfather to Charles Gayarré, the historian of Louisiana.

[2] Etienne Bernard Alexandre Viel was born in New Orleans in 1736, and died in France in his 86th year. After the suppression of the Society of Jesus he lived for many years in Attakapas, where he was much beloved. The greater part of his life was spent in teaching. Many considered him the greatest living Latinist. Judge Gayarré told the writer that he was a fanatic in his love for Latin, and thought nothing fit to be published except what was in Latin. He translated Telemachus into beautiful Latin verse, and the work was splendidly brought out by some distinguished men who had been his pupils. Gayarré, in his youth, saw that work and others from the same learned pen.

time passed quickly, and on reaching the shore they saw to their dismay that the vessel had departed.

The unfortunate men found they had exchanged the perils of the ocean for those of the wilderness. They hoped, but in vain, that the captain might send a boat back for them. The keen gnawings of hunger they stayed with berries, worms, and insects. Belle-Isle's hunting dog was doomed, but he could not slay it, and the poor animal escaped when another essayed to do the deed.

One by one his companions died of hunger. He buried them, and "watered their graves with his tears." After the burial of the last his truant dog returned with a wood-rat, which gave master and dog a dainty meal. Once, while his master slept, a panther steathily approached him, which the dog attacked and vanquished, but was so badly lacerated that his master compassionately put an end to his sufferings.

Again, alone in the wilds, Belle-Isle reverently knelt to thank God for his safety, and implore His further protection. By traces of human footprints he was guided to a pirogue tossing in a stream. Crossing to the other side, he saw Indians feasting. They were man-eaters (Attukapaw). The cadaverous Frenchman they regarded as a spectre. He made signs that he was hungry, whereupon they offered him human flesh and fish. No need to say he chose the latter.

The Indians spared his life, intending to fatten him for a barbecue. They took him to their village and appropriated his miserable belongings. He was made slave to a widowed squaw, who treated him well, and whose papooses he aired in a cradle fastened to his bare shoulders. The prospect of being sacrificed to their deities, and having his flesh served up at their revels, retarded his improvement. He soon acquired their language and had the happiness to learn that the warriors in council assembled had decided it would be base and treacherous to kill a stranger who had come to their wigwams for hospitality.

His mistress allowed him considerable liberty. He accompanied the braves on their hostile excursions. Human flesh and venison were the delicacies prepared for these expeditions. Once, when he unwittingly ate a piece of dried human flesh, the savage commissary said: "You improve. You will soon be a true Attakapas, and 'eat man' as well as any of us." This, with the powerful aid of the imagination, brought about an inversion of the muscles of the epigastric region; a violent upheaval and the loss of a dinner followed.

After some years, deputies from a distant tribe came to smoke the calumet with the cannibals. Seeing Belle-Isle, they remarked that there were pale faces in a neighboring nation, also. He questioned them. Fortunately he had preserved his commission as an

officer. On the reverse of it he wrote with a crow-quill and ink manufactured from soot:

"I am M. de Belle-Isle who was abandoned at St. Bernard's Bay. My companions died of grief and hunger. I am a captive among the Attakapas." This "talking paper" he begged an Indian to convey to the French Chief in New Orleans, who would liberally reward him. Another Indian tried to take it, but he escaped by swimming across a river, holding the letter aloft that it might not get wet. After a journey of 150 miles, he reached the French post and delivered it. On hearing it read, the people wept aloud after the manner of the Indians. Being asked what troubled them, they said they were grieving for their brother, a prisoner among the Attakapas. The Indians offered to rescue him. Ten went, all well mounted. On reaching the Attakapas village, they discharged their muskets. The savages took the report for thunder. A letter to Belle-Isle ordered him to surrender himself to his red visitors, and his hosts, terrified by the roar of musketry, did not dare to oppose his abduction. The woman whom he had served wept piteously, and it was with difficulty he tore himself from her. Bienville richly rewarded his deliverers and sent a valuable present to the Attakapas. A deputation, which, to the great delight of our hero, included his adopted mother, came to New Orleans to thank the Governor and form an alliance with the French. The Chief, pointing to the former captive, said to Bienville: "This white man, my father, is your flesh and blood, but by adoption he is one of us. His brothers died of hunger, but had they been met by my nation they would to-day be alive and free."

From that period the Attakapas always treated strangers humanely, and gradually abandoned their barbarous custom of eating human flesh.

Now it is probable that the above incidents became the occasion of sending missionaries to the friendly Attakapas. As late as 1776 Galvez, when preparing to do battle with the English, recruited among them and other tribes 160 Indian warriors. It is noted that in this campaign they refrained from doing the slightest injury to the fugitives whom they captured, and even brought the babes they found with their mothers ambushed in the woods in their arms to Galvez. But the partial suppression of the Society of Jesus in 1763, and its total suppression in 1773, deprived these intelligent barbarians of their spiritual fathers. They dwindled away, and many wholly lost the faith once delivered to them by saints.

In 1804, when Father Isabey, a holy Dominican, made his way to the "Poste des Attakapas," he suffered much hard treatment from the Indians he met on his way, remnants of the Attakapas, now entirely extinct. Among other cruelties to which they sub-

jected him was the pulling off of the nails of his fingers and toes. Francis Chauvet, who lived in a wooden hut facing the Tèche, and died there, a centenarian, not many years ago, distinctly remembered and graphically described the maimed condition of this worthy priest when rescued from these cruel savages.

IV.

But long before the granulation of cane juice, indeed before the captivity of the hapless Belle-Isle, events occurred at the other end of North America destined to give new settlers to the blooming llanos of the Attakapas. Nova Scotia (Acadie) had been peopled by Normans and Burgundians who reclaimed thousands of acres from the muddy waters of the Bay of Fundy, and lived by their daily toil in peace and plenty. They had schools, churches, priests, even musical chimes, which, thanks to our American poet, will ring out forever in song and story. By the treaty of Utrecht, 1713, Louis XIV. ceded Acadie to Queen Anne. The inhabitants were to retain their lands on swearing allegiance to the British monarch. But they refused to take any oath that could bind them to bear arms against France, and though known later as French Neutrals, their new masters refused to believe in their neutrality.

They were cajoled, deceived, lulled into a false security by vague promises, and as they held the best lands, their enemies finally decided on a wholesale spoliation. The terrible vengeance wreaked on these sturdy farmers will ever remain a shameful blot on the blurred escutcheon of England. They were accused of aiding their brethren in Canada and inciting the Indians to rebellion. And it was known that in the attack against Beauséjour some Acadians had battled under the lilies against the British flag.

On September 5, 1755, the Acadians, in response to an official mandate, assembled in their chapels to hear important details as to their future relations with the British Lion, then represented by the despicable George II. With sad amazement they perceived the handwriting that was against them. Their smiling farms were to be devastated, their houses levelled. Ships were in readiness to take them they knew not whither. The roads from the chapels to the shore were alive with men, women, and children, weeping, praying, or mournfully chanting their favorite hymn to the Sacred Heart of our Saviour. Now began their melancholy exile, "exile without an end and without an example in story."

They were scattered throughout the British Colonies from New Hampshire to Georgia, among people whose language they knew not and whose creed they abhorred. Everywhere they were regarded as "an intolerable burden," and they retained under all cir-

cumstances "an unconquerable dislike to the English."[1] Husbands and wives, parents and children, were separated. Many escaped to some French settlement. Those who remained were for the most part gradually absorbed by the population—one of many circumstances which show how the genuine Anglo-Saxon stock, if there be any such in America, has been "watered."

The army chaplains of the French detachments that came to America during the Revolution to help the patriots in their struggle against England, were often surrounded by people of Irish and Acadian lineage who had never before seen a priest.

After wandering for a decade as helots and paupers, some 600 Acadians made their way to New Orleans. Their sorrowful faces, as they drew up on the Levée and the old Place d'Armes, evoked the deepest sympathy of their compatriots in the little town over which the spotless banner still waved. The Ursulines, the only nuns from the St. Lawrence to the Gulf, received many of the women and children. The doors of every house were thrown open to the rest.

Nothing could be more different from the snug farms and smiling meadows of "Acadie, the home of the happy," than the New Orleans of that day. It was bounded rear and sides by a cypress swamp; in front was the river, ever threatening to submerge its one-story houses and palmetto huts. The population was about 3000, of whom perhaps a third were blacks; and it is certainly no slander to say that neither race was over-burdened with energy. In the centre of the town, facing the river, was the modest brick church erected in 1725, which was swept away in the terrible conflagration of 1788.

The religious state of New Orleans at this epoch was deplorable. In 1763, the Superior Council issued a decree of banishment against the Society of Jesus. From this blow the Church of Colonial Louisiana never wholly recovered. The baseness and tyranny of this insignificant body, composed almost entirely of wicked or ignorant men, are indescribable. The property of the Jesuits was confiscated and sold for 180,000 dollars. Their chapels were levelled to the ground, and the faithful in many places left without priest or altar. Among the sacrilegious wretches that aided in this infamous work, Lafrénière, of the Superior Council, stands con-

[1] During the civil war several Louisiana regiments were composed largely of "Cayjuns" (Acadians), who, regarding the war as a fight against the Yankees, descendants of their ancient enemies, the English, fought furiously. Their "Cayjun" battle-cries, prolonged shrieks like the war-whoop of the Indians, struck terror into the hearts of their opponents. The Unionists are charged with wreaking awful vengeance on St. Martinsville and every other haunt of the wild and vengeful Acadian.

spicuous. And his fate, and that of his confederates, a few years later, was a terrible instance of Divine retribution.[1]

The Acadians found a struggle for supremacy going on between Fathers Hilaire de Génovaux[2] and Dagobert.[3] In 1766 the Superior Council expelled the former and made the latter, who bore a most unsavory reputation, head of religion in Louisiana. The former was for some time pastor of the Attakapas, but nothing is known of his career at that "Poste" save that he kept no records, or, if he did, they were afterwards lost, as Father Barrière charitably suggests.

The mere sight of the Bourbon *fleur-de-lis* thrilled the hearts of the Acadians and kindled gleams of triumph in their sad eyes. But their joy was allayed when they learned that Louisiana was, theoretically, a Spanish province. Louis XV., like his great-grandfather, Louis XIV., grew tired of paying the expenses of a colony that brought him no return. In 1762 he ceded his broad lands below the lakes to other powers, and the parts in which we are now interested fell to Spain. But the Catholic king was in no hurry to accept the gift his royal brother had thrust upon him. And, as no representative of the majesty of Spain appeared for years, people began to imagine—the wish being father to the thought—that the transfer announced by Louis XV. to Governor Abbadie, in April, 1764, had not taken place even on paper, and that the Treaty of Cession was but a sham instrument.

Other bands of Acadians appeared on the scene. Many had tried the French West India Islands, but under torrid skies they could not live. In February, 1766, 216 Acadians were added to the population of Louisiana. The Acadian Coast, on both sides of the Mississippi, above New Orleans, was colonized by Acadians. Rations and instruments of husbandry were supplied them at the

---

[1] Lafrénière and four others were shot in New Orleans in 1769, for high treason. Felix del Rey, O'Reilly's lawyer, spoke of him with withering contempt as an unfaithful officer and the chief instigator of conspiracy against his king, whose money he was receiving as Attorney-General while driving his fellow-citizens to rebellion against him.

[2] Génovaux quarrelled with the Jesuit Vicar-General, and joined the Spanish friars against Père Dagobert. He professed to be neutral. Dagobert besought Governor Unzaga to prevent Génovaux from abusing him, "as he was in the habit of doing every day."

[3] For many reasons the writer cannot believe that Dagobert was as bad as a late historian has painted him. If he were, his conduct could scarcely have escaped the eagle eye of Count O'Reilly, who lived within a few yards of him, and who would have had him removed for far less than his accusers say against him. The chief authority against him was Cyrilo, who came to supplant him, and who at that time did not understand French, and was, moreover, ignorant of the customs of Louisiana. On the arrival of the Spanish Capuchins Dagobert had been over fifty years in New Orleans and was at least seventy-four years old.

expense of the government, and many made their way to the flowery meadows of the Attakapas.

It was certainly for God and their country that some 7000 Acadians suffered the horrors of an exile unexampled in history. But the constant and bitter persecution to which they were subjected in "the house of bondage" broke their spirits in many instances; nor could they withstand that worse ordeal, intimacy with free-thinking Frenchmen. Bishop Carroll notices the deterioration of the Acadians in Baltimore. Something similar might be observed even in the remote Attakapas, and early in the next century Father Dufour informs us that only six people attended his first Mass in St. Martinsville. The vicious Frenchmen who labored with a zeal worthy of a better cause to disseminate irreligion, corrupted the Acadians wherever they were exposed to this evil influence. At an earlier epoch they became the accomplices or tools of the vile men who arrogated to themselves supreme power in Church and State before the arrival of O'Reilly. They were among the armed insurgents who paraded the streets of New Orleans, and sustained the Supreme Council when that body ordered the expulsion of Governor Ulloa, in 1768. In the report to his government of this insurrection, Ulloa charges the Acadians, with the Germans, with being guilty of ingratitude, "they having received nothing but benefits from the Spaniards."

Indeed, the inhabitants of the Attakapas received only kindness from the Spaniards. When they complained to O'Reilly, he listened gently to their grievances, and rectified them, as far as possible, on the spot. De Clouet,[1] who was commandant of the "Poste" in his time, is to-day represented by numerous descendants in the vicinity of St. Martinsvile, and much information referring to these early days may be gathered from this fine family. As to the Indians, O'Reilly officially declared that it was "contrary to the mild and beneficent laws of Spain to hold them in slavery." His closest attention was given to everything regarding the divine worship. He even requested the commandant to keep the church at Natchitoches clear of dogs during divine worship. The *alcaldes* and *alguazil* or mayor, with the *escribano*, were commanded to visit all prisoners every week, and the governor several times a year. The humane and Christian regulations established in Louisiana by this great man reflect high honor on Spanish colonial legislation.

---

1 Opelousas was governed from Attakapas; but in 1787, as the population had largely increased, Opelousas was made a distinct command under Nicholas Forstall, while the Attakapas remained in charge of Chevalier de Clouet. Forstall (possibly Forristal), was an Irishman, and carried with him everywhere a huge genealogical tree, which showed his descent from the Kings of Ireland. He was an upright, pious man. Many of his descendants bearing the name Forstall may yet be found in Louisiana.

V.

We have seen that the Attakapas country was peopled chiefly by Canadians and Acadians, originally of the same stock. The religious wars and other disturbances of New Orleans, the civil and ecclesiastical headquarters, found but little echo in this peaceful region. The "Poste" was seldom without a priest. There is a regular succession of pastors up to 1889. Except in administering the sacraments of baptism and matrimony, and burying the dead, the pastor had little to do for the white male portion of his congregation. Governor Unzaga says: "The men never confessed after their first communion—would think it hypocrisy to do so."[1] But they were all anxious to have the ministrations of the Church when fatal illness seized them.

The Acadians have kept distinct from the Louisiana Creoles, and have been strangely improgressive.[2] "My mother cooked in this manner, so shall I." "My father got along without that invention, so can I." "What was good enough for our parents will do for us." These and similar responses are given in Acadian *patois* to those who speak to them of modern improvements. They are called "Cayjuns," a corruption of "Acadians," and the Creoles rather look down on them for their peculiar habits and strange dialect. They dwell mostly in unpainted structures called *maisons d' Acadiens*, small but solidly built cottages of cypress:

> "Near to the bank of the river, overshadowed by oaks from whose branches
> Garlands of Spanish moss and of mystic mistletoe flaunted,
> Such as the Druids cut down with golden hatchets at yule-tide,
> Stood secluded and still the house of the herdsman."

The Acadians usually marry young and have large families. Among them the cradle is never empty. They are a peaceful, industrious race, strongly attached to their homes and families. Among their faults and those of the Creoles are a habit of marrying relations, and sometimes a passion for gambling, and very sad the consequences often are. Though both families fled from English tyranny in Canada and Nova Scotia, they have never been anxious to receive settlers of other races. A more liberal spirit is now beginning to prevail among the foremost inhabitants. Conservative as the Gallic races are, the railroad, immigration, and the introduction of the English language will have swept away their exclusiveness before the close of the nineteenth century.

The headquarters of Attakapas is St. Martinsville, a village of some two thousand souls. But places of equal or greater impor-

---

[1] Much the same is said by Cyrilo in his report to the Bishop of Santiago de Cuba. But both reports refer perhaps only to New Orleans, and are probably exaggerated.

[2] Several Acadians have attained eminence as lawyers and soldiers.

tance now stud that romantic region. St. Martin is no longer, as before the war, a little Paris. Its beauty even then could not have been of the architectural order, for there are no remains of any buildings save the plainest. But boundless prairies dotted with sheep and cattle, vast plantations of sugar-cane, the majestic trees that shade the bayou, endless hedges of wild roses, "the flowers that bloom in the spring" in tens of thousands, but, above all, the winding Tèche, make the parish of St. Martin "a thing of beauty and a joy forever."

The religious history of this region may be gathered from the church registers and from tradition. The inhabitants have preserved many of the peculiarities of speech and manner that characterized their ancestors, and have never lost the Faith.

The oldest register is copied from that of Pointe Coupée, a district visited by all the political and religious celebrities of early days, from O'Reilly to Peñalver. Though much worn, one can count on it eighty-two baptisms and twelve marriages from 1756 to 1773. The "Poste des Attakapas" had at first no resident priest, and the sacraments were administered there by Father Didur, of Pointe Coupée, and Friar Valentine, of Natchitoches. Register No. 1, in the archives of St. Martin, is a small folio bound in parchment, in a very dilapidated condition. Here is a copy of a note on page 1, which gives interesting details of the origin of the Church of the Attakapas:

"In Nomine J. Amen.

"This book has been made to serve as a register for Baptisms, Marriages and Burials, in the Parish of the Poste des Attakapas, beginning from 1765, Father John Francis officiating. . . . . This colony belonged to France, but by the Treaty of Peace it was ceded to Spain. The Pastors that succeeded F. John Francis are Rev. Hilaire de Génovaux, French, and Rev. Joseph d'Arazena, Spaniard. No register of F. Hilary's administration can be found. We do not think he neglected to note what happened, but that his register was lost. F. d'Arazena took possession of this Parish Jan. 20, 1782. He wrote 2 small books in which baptisms, marriages, and burials, of whites and of blacks, are noted. These were left to F. Gefrotin, a Dominican, who succeeded him in 1783. Another register was found which helped to replace things in order. . . . . These originals are of great use in enabling us to give correct records. . . . . We beg pastors to use this and no other."

F. Marceda became pastor in 1787, F. de Deva in 1788. As a rule, priests did not remain long at this Poste. In 1791, F. de Deva was suceeded by Father George Murphy, an Irish secular priest. He labored in these parts with great zeal from 1789 to 1794, and was noted for his gifts as a preacher. He exercised the

sacred ministry in various languages, among them English, French, and Spanish. During his incumbency, we find the first mention of St. Martin as patron of the Poste des Attakapas. It was made in 1793 by his assistant, F. Pedro de Camora.[1] In the book of burials, Father Murphy speaks of the Church of St. Martin,[2] February 6, 1794.

After more than four years' fruitful labor, Rev. George Murphy left the humble parsonage of St. Martin.

The transfer of Louisiana to Spain was, on the whole, favorable to religion. The Catholic kings showed great zeal for the progress of the Gospel. In 1772 Father Cyrilo and four other Capuchins came to New Orleans to replace their lax French brethren, who, however, refused to be replaced. Headed by the famous Père Dagobert, they had so won the people, and prejudiced them against the Spanish clergy, that Governor Unzaga feared to remove them. Governor Miro, however, supported Cyrilo, and some semblance of order was drawn out of chaos. Cyrilo wrote very disparagingly of religion in Louisiana. "It is more difficult," said he, "to weed the garden of New Orleans than it was to plant it in the beginning."

Up to this time no bishop had visited Louisiana, and no priest had been empowered to administer confirmation. The king of Spain desired that his Louisiana subjects might receive that great sacrament, and, on his recommendation (1779), the Holy See appointed an auxiliary to the bishopric of Santiago de Cuba, who was to exercise his functions in Louisiana. The austere Cyrilo, consecrated in 1781, was chosen for this office—a choice that did not give universal satisfaction. Being really a holy and zealous man, the bishop infused new life into the country parishes, which he visited assiduously, and he was a terror to the evil-doers who have made the ecclesiastical history of the time and place so painful to the Catholic student. In 1786 he issued a pastoral, in which he eloquently urged his flock to attend Mass on Sundays and holy days, and censured the wicked custom of the negroes who, at the vesper hour every

---

[1] Perhaps this priest is identical with Rev. Peter de Zamora, who came to Louisiana with Sebastian O'Farrell, Marquis of Casacalvo, and received faculties from Very Rev. Thomas Hassett, April 11, 1804. Casacalvo was Governor of Louisiana, 1799–1801.

[2] This would indicate that Longfellow was a little premature in calling the capital of the Attakapas St. Martin. It began to be generally so called only in the beginning of the present century. Over the high altar of the church is an old painting of St. Martin dividing his cloak with a beggar.

Le Sieur Louis Charles de Blanç, captain in the armies of the king of Spain, was civil and military commandant of the Poste des Attakapas in 1800. The writer thinks that he is the first commandant of whom it is recorded that he resided at St. Martinsville. His descendants are numerous about the old Poste.

Sunday, assembled in a green, still called Congo Square, to dance the bamboula and throw the wanga, and worship the serpent with hideous rites imported from Africa by the Yolofs, Foulahs, Bambarras, Mandingoes and other races of the dark continent.

While changes went on at headquarters, the Church of the Attakapas, save for the appointment or confirming of a pastor, seems to have been left severely alone. There is no record, so far as we can ascertain, that the zealous Bishop Cyrilo ever evangelized "the black, white, and brown" dwellers on these "sultry savannahs." He visited many other country churches, as is evident from the registers, which he caused to be kept in Spanish, not in French as heretofore. The many Irish clergy scattered throughout the territory over which this prelate held spiritual sway,—Fathers Burke, Walsh, White, Hassett, O'Reilly, Crosby, Barry, Savage, McKenna, etc.,—who had been accustomed to make these entries in Latin, are commanded to keep their books henceforth in Spanish. But no order of this nature is recorded in the Attakapas register till March 26, 1796.

The reward which so often comes to the zealous and saintly in this life overtook Bishop Cyrilo in the midst of his labors for souls. He was suspended by the king,[1] and commanded to return to his province, Catalonia. A long letter, dated November 23, 1793, from Charles IV., signed *Yo el Rey*, gave him this unwelcome news, and in 1794 he left Louisiana forever. He was delayed at Havana for want of means to take him to Spain in compliance with the royal ukase, and was still in that city in 1799, the incumbent of Havana refusing to pay his salary till the king interfered. Well might this holy man, persecuted by his brethren, his king, and the abandoned souls for whom he toiled, exclaim: "I have loved justice and hated iniquity, therefore I die in a strange land."

On October 19, 1796, the "Poste des Attakapas" saw a bishop for the first time. On the 26th of March, the pastor, styled by Bishop Peñalver "Don Miguel Bernardo de Barrière," made the first Spanish entry in his register, probably because he had on that day received official notice of the coming of his bishop. This visitation is the only one made during the Spanish domination.

In the bull which makes New Orleans the see of a diocese bounded north and east by the diocese of Baltimore, and south and west by Linares and Durango, Pius VI. gives as his reason for forming Louisiana and Florida into a separate diocese "the miserable state of religion and ecclesiastical discipline" in these parts.

---

[1] The King of Spain as "Protector of the Council of Trent" assumed great authority in Church matters.

Don Luis Peñalver y Cardenas[1], having been the right hand of the bishop at Havana, was well aware of the deplorable condition of the diocese confided to his pastoral care. His coming was hailed with delight by the Governor, Baron Carondelet, who had reported adversely on Church matters in his province, and seen with grief the unsuccessful efforts of Cyrilo to correct abuses. The bishop's instructions to his clergy show that he was filled with the spirit of God and an ardent zeal for souls. From the St. Martinsville register, "Parroquia de San Martin des *Atacapaz*," we gather that he made a careful examination of all the records that could be found, noted their defects, and put them in the best order possible. The great distinction always kept up in Louisiana between people of unmixed European origin and the other races, is apparent from these records, as the "whites, the blacks, and the browns" are entered separately in the lists of baptisms, marriages, and burials. As in New Orleans and other parts of Louisiana, there were in the Attakapas negroes, Indians, Mestizos (children of the white and the Indian), griffe (of the African and the Indian), mulatto, mulatre, mulatress (of the white and black). These mixed races the bishop calls *browns*, *morenos*. Later, however, cognizance was taken but of two classes: the whites, Europeans and their descendants, and the colored.[2]

Bishop Peñalver's entry in the *Atacapaz* register is signed simply: "El Obisbo de la Luisiana."

The bishop did not forget the *Atacapaz*. Three years later he speaks of that district as one into which evil men had penetrated —adventurers who "have no religion, acknowledge no God, and have deteriorated the morals of the people."

Louisiana was soon to lose this zealous prelate. In 1801 he was made Archbishop of Guatemala. The diocese was now governed by Canon Thomas Hassett, head of the Cathedral chapter, with whom was associated Very Rev. Patrick Walsh. These worthy and learned Irish priests, who had labored long in the diocese and were most useful in a cosmopolitan city as speaking several European languages, were not destined to live many years

---

[1] According to Spanish custom, he bore his mother's name as well as his father's. His parents were Don Diego Peñalver and Doña Maria Luisa de Cardenas.

[2] To evade O'Reilly's merciful law which forbade the enslaving of Indians, these poor people were often classed with the mulattoes as colored.

The Spaniards were most kind to the Indians. In May, 1784, Indian congresses were held with great pomp at Pensacola and Mobile, at which Count Arthur O'Neil and Governor Miro presided. Of the treaty framed on that occasion, here is an article: "In conformity with the humane and generous sentiments of the Spanish nation, we (the Indians) renounce forever the custom of raising scalps, and making slaves of our white captives," etc.

under the American flag.[1] Fr. Hassett, whose health was broken by the severity of his apostolic labors in a climate which had never agreed with him, died suddenly in April, 1804. The closing years of Father Walsh were embittered by the frequent rebellions of Fray Antonio Sedilla. After an illness of five days, possibly yellow fever, the administrator died August 22, 1806. Posthumous honors of every description were lavished on a priest who had during life won the respect of friend and foe. Father Walsh's official title was: "Vicar-General and Governor *ad interim* of the diocese." His remains lie beneath the sanctuary of the old Ursuline chapel. The cathedral being under an interdict, in consequence of the usurpation of Sedilla, this was the only place in the city in which Mass could be offered or the sacraments administered. Besides, Father Walsh was a benefactor of the Ursuline community.

VI.

The French in Louisiana have been singularly barren of vocations to the priesthood. The first century and a half produced one, the learned Father Viel. The bishops of Louisiana have always been natives of other countries. In the diocese of New Orleans to-day there are among the secular clergy only two priests of Creole parentage. Several youths of that race have, however, joined the Jesuits and other religious bodies. In 1794 Father Viel became seventh pastor of Attakapas, or rather exercised his priestly functions there when required, for, we regret to say, he is marked in the register, "Not approved." A writer of distinguished ability, he consoled himself in the troubles of life by devoting his leisure hours to the muses. Though "not approved," probably because he had been a Jesuit, he is known traditionally as an excellent priest. The distinguished men whom he had educated comforted his old age by their filial attentions, and published a magnificent edition of his works.

F. de Barrière, an *émigré*, eighth pastor of this "Poste," arrived[2]

---

[1] Fray Antonio Sedilla, known traditionally as Père Antoine, came to New Orleans in Governor Miro's time, to introduce the Inquisition; but Miro shipped him back to Spain at once. He returned and ingratiated himself with the people, who supported him in his rebellions against Administrator Walsh and Bishop Dubourg. The stories of his immorality the writer cannot believe. He lived forty years in New Orleans, baptized and married almost everybody. His closing years were edifying. He went barefoot, wore a coarse brown habit, and a rope as his girdle. It is said he received from the people 30 to 40 thousand dollars a year, and gave all to the poor. He lived in a hovel behind the Cathedral. Several persons still living knew him well. One describes him as a prodigy of ignorance, not able even to speak or write his own language correctly, and, as a director, very easy. He died in 1829. The Legislature adjourned to attend his funeral.

[2] F. de Barrière lived about a mile from the village, but walked in every day to say

March 8, 1795, and remained till 1804. His name occurs from time to time till 1830, and is also found in the register of Opelousas and Lafayette, where he was pastor successively. He returned to France and died in his native city, Bordeaux.

As time wore on, the early settlers were joined by friends and relatives, and it was decided to build a village. A surveyor, named Johnson, drew the plan, but the progress was slow. The houses were very plain, and did not extend further than what is now Main street. The oldest inhabitants of a few years ago remembered the last years and death of the centenarian, François Chauvet, who lived near the bayou. When he arrived at the "Poste," Main street was part of a vast prairie. He worshiped in the first chapel, a small frame building, memorable, says tradition, for the visit of Evangeline. The poor presbytery was said, in 1795, to be the oldest house in the village. That the church was built in 1770 may be inferred from the fact that it was at that period Mr. d'Hauterive gave the land the church and its dependencies now occupy, and on which a large part of the town is built. From this donation arises the obligation of many property holders to pay rent to the church. It must be remembered that during the Spanish domination the inhabitants paid no taxes. The clergymen were liberally paid by the king of Spain, who even furnished necessaries for the church. Spanish galleons brought their hundreds of thousands of solid money from Mexico to Louisiana every year to pay the expenses of Church and State.

From 1802 to 1840, 2198 baptisms of blacks are registered. Up to 1887 there are recorded in the archives of St. Martin 19,692 baptisms, 3527 marriages and 7227 burials.

F. Gabriel Isabey exercised the ministry at St. Martinsville from 1804 till his death, of heart disease, July 21, 1823. During his administration the ecclesiastical extension of the parish was divided. This priest was greatly beloved. He had a pleasant face, was tall, well proportioned,[1] and possessed of elegant manners. His gentleness and amiability gained all hearts, and when he died there was general mourning. He owned a plantation, of which his nephew, Mark, took care. Little children were greatly attached to him. A venerable lady tells that when she was four or five years old, she went to his door, and calling his old servant, Sylvain, by his pet name, said: "Vain-vain, where is Isabey?" The good priest came out and gave her cakes and candy. The memories of childhood are never forgotten, and to her latest breath she recalled this incident with pleasure. Vain-vain could not survive his

Mass. The church was small and poor. On Sundays he remained about the church all day.

[1] The writer has a miniature of Father Isabey which bears out this description.

master. He ran through the village, exclaiming in his picturesque jargon: *Maite mouri, Négue mouri.* His intense grief deprived him of the little sense he once had. He bought a loaf and got a bottle of water, and laid them on Père Isabey's grave: "Cé pour *vouyage* là," said he. He wandered in the wood, which at that time surrounded the church, striking his head against the trees and crying out: *Maite mouri, Négue mouri.* A few days later the body of the poor Congo was found floating on the Tèche.

Even the animals loved this good man. After his funeral his favorite cat disappeared, and every one was asking: "Where is Père Isabey's cat?" But the poor animal was soon forgotten. Years after, when the church was about to be enlarged, the whole village assembled to see the remains of F. Isabey exhumed. The skeleton of the cat was found at the foot of his coffin.

Father Borella, an Italian, came to St. Martin at the age of fifty, August 20, 1819. He was pastor of the parish from the death of F. Isabey till his own, January 21, 1836. He left $16,000 to enlarge the church. His grave in the cemetery being neglected, his remains were removed to the church, where they now repose.

In 1826 and 1827 multitudes of Congo negroes used to assemble every Sunday on the green before the church and dance under the trees. This gave no small annoyance to the pastor, the dances being part of the hideous rites with which these benighted people worshipped their idols. But gradually they became Christians, and the horrible ceremonies entirely disappeared.

Under the administration of Father Borella the parish was again divided. Of Father Brasseur, who succeeded him, 1830 to 1840, no traditions seem to have been preserved. The same may be said of F. de St. Aubin, 1840 to 1841. In 1842 the fourteenth pastor, Father Martin, arrived. He was seventy years old, and soon became paralyzed, except as to his tongue. A priest, aged thirty, F. Bérel, assisted. This poor young man became very ill, and a charitable woman took care of him. One day she left him in charge of a colored servant, and coming in the evening to see how he fared, she found him alone and dying. She raised his head on her arm, and he cried out: "A little water, for the love of God." But before she had time to assuage his thirst, he was dead. Father Lucas was curate from 1843 to 1845.

Father Dufour, fifteenth pastor, had a very pleasing countenance, and despite a frankness that sometimes gave offence to those he reproved, was generally beloved. He had a great gift of eloquence. The first Sunday he officiated only six persons were present at Mass. Yet he preached a most powerful sermon. His auditors spread his fame as an eloquent speaker, and the second Sunday eighty came to Mass. The church was soon too small for

the congregation. But this brilliant man could not long content himself in such a Sleepy Hollow. He left on April 29, 1848, deeply regretted. The ancients still speak of him with admiration and affection. Of his successor, J. Jacques Fontbonne, no details have reached us.

About this period the shrill whistle of the steamboat was heard for the first time on the Tèche. *Le Correo*, Captain Curry, began to ply regularly between New Orleans and St. Martinsville. The inhabitants built a beautiful steamer which they called "Attakapas." The captain belonged to a family well-known in these regions, Delahoussaye. Every arrival of this handsome "greyhound" of the river was announced by a volley of musketry.

VII.

The seventeenth pastor, Ange Marie Felix Jan, was born at Pontivy, April 11, 1802. The official record of his birth is dated: "Le vingt et un Germinal de l'an dixième de la République Française, une et indivisible." He was baptized stealthily in a hospital. Becoming an orphan at a tender age, he was placed by his godfather and guardian, Ange Marie Chassin, at the Jesuit College of Ste. Anne d' Auray, where he remained seven years. A letter from the president, which the old priest carefully preserved, bears high testimony to his literary ability and good conduct, and describes his life as most Christian and edifying. He desired to become a Jesuit, but his guardian opposed him, and he entered the Sulpitian College at Paris, in 1823. In 1826 he finished his philosophy and theology, and was ordained in May, 1826. The ceremonies began at 6 A.M. and were not over till 2 P.M. Père Jan always spoke with enthusiasm of Archbishop de Quélen. "Ah," he would say, "Monseigneur was not handsome, but what dignity, what nobility in his demeanor, especially when he officiated! And with what fervor and piety he celebrated Mass!"

The young priest made a series of resolutions which are those of a saintly soul, and to which he adhered to the end of his long life. Love of the Blessed Virgin was almost a passion with him. From childhood he recited his rosary every day.

His first charge was to teach the catechism classes for four hours a day. He was so devoted to this duty that, even as an old man, he loved to recall this period, and spoke of it as the happiest of his life. He was exceedingly modest, and it was but rarely he raised a little the veil which covered his life in France. The superb ceremonies that celebrated the coronation of Charles X. were never effaced from his memory. The grand tableau made by the princes, cardinals, ambassadors, and all the great orders of the state, gratified his natural love of the beautiful; "but," he would say when

describing the scene, "the most imposing figure there was Monseigneur de Quélen."

Père Jan, like the other members of his family, was a royalist. In this he never changed, and towards the close of his life showed the deepest feeling at the death of the Count de Chambord. He related that when that prince was only five years old, he and other seminarians met him with the Duchess de Guyon in the gardens of the Tuilleries. The Duchess asked the young people if they would like to see the prince. "Oh, yes, Madame la Duchesse, we should be most happy," was the reply. But princes of five are happily like other children of the same age, and the royal child, intimidated by the crowd of young men, hid his face in his hands. But in a moment he recovered the self-possession taught him from the cradle; and when the lady said: "Salute these gentlemen, Monseigneur," the charming child advanced most graciously and murmured in his sweet voice, "good morning, gentlemen." The seminarians gave a hearty cheer for the Count de Chambord.

A second time Père Jan sought to enter the Society of Jesus, but his confessor said: "No; go back to Brittany." He obeyed, simply, and we next hear of him as curate of the Cathedral of Vannes. Here, as everywhere else, he won golden opinions, and we have the written testimony of the senior canon as to the great sanctity of his life and his zeal for souls. Equally fruitful in virtue was his sojourn at Nantes, as the bishop and clergy of that city bore witness.[1]

Among his penitents at Nantes was a Carmelite nun, Madame Fidelis, who escaped the massacre of '92, and sought refuge first with her family, who were rich, and then in Spain. When the evil days were over, she returned, hoping to gain admittance to some cloister. In Spain she had endured all sorts of privations, and lost her health, she said, by the heat of the Spanish sun. She rented a little room near the cathedral, and never left it but at day-break to hear Mass. The rest of the day it was carefully barricaded. She was nearly ninety, and very delicate. Père Jan often visited her. One day he found her very sad. "I have suffered agonies," said she, "because my servant, being angry with me, opened the doors and windows and let in the sun's rays." And she wept bitterly. The young priest consoled her and promised to come every morning to see that the sun was not allowed to molest her. In gratitude she gave him a beautiful gold cross of ancient workmanship, which a few years before his death he presented to the

[1] Père Jan preserved the letters received from the ecclesiastical authorities under whom he had worked, probably because he did not wish to be identified with such of his clerical countrymen as had come to Louisiana without being sent or invited and without the proper credentials.

writer of this article. He established a foundation Mass to be said every feast of Our Lady of Mount Carmel for poor Madame Fidelis after her happy death, and always offered Mass for her soul on the 16th of July.

Seven Visitation nuns who had been driven from their monastery came to Nantes; Père Jan gave them a house, and found them means to live in community. Their superior, whom he highly esteemed, gave him a curious silver cross that had belonged to one of the first Visitation mothers. This relic he bestowed a few years ago on the Convent of Mercy, St. Martinsville. Among these Visitandines was "une Janseniste," whom he could not convert, and who, to his great grief, died as she had lived.

Père Jan was placed over the *Young Workmen* at Rouen in 1838, and made *aumonier* of the Hotel Dieu a little later. Desiring to participate in the good works of the Trappists, he was aggregated to them in 1842. In 1848 he was sent as missionary apostolic to Hayti, and his adventures in that isle, where he at first gained the good will of the terrible Soulouque, would fill a volume. Having received from this worthy himself a peremptory order to quit, he put himself under the protection of the French consul. But he was obliged to leave, and on returning to France, in May, 1849, after visiting Nantes and Paris, he spent some time in the Château de la Motte with his devoted friend, Madame la Marquise de St. Léonard, partly, it is said, to escape the mitre, and partly to mature his plans for devoting himself to the foreign mission, for which he had always had a great desire. In January, 1851, he presented himself to Archbishop Blanc, who had invited him, and was just then in need of a pastor for St. Martinsville. He merely passed through New Orleans and never returned, devoting himself to the welfare of his people with an energy that never relaxed. He never left his post even for a day, never left his house save for the church, the schools, or the sick. He was a priest for over sixty years, during which his daily Mass was omitted only three times. Tobacco he never touched, save a little in the form of snuff, and he was a total abstainer. When not among the sick or in the schools, he almost lived in the confessional.[1] Money he never mentioned. If some were given him, it merely touched his hand for a blessing, and then went to the poor, especially those who had known better days—a numerous class in Louisiana since the Civil War. The annuity that came to him from his patrimony in France went the same way. That he might be better able to help the

1 This was especially the case at Easter-tide. Père Jan was in the confessional at daybreak. About 7 o'clock he left it to say Mass. After his thanksgiving he returned. After each confession—in case of persons who lived at a distance—he would give the absolved penitent holy communion. He seldom broke his fast until after 3 P.M.

needy, his dress and food and sleeping-room were those of a pauper. Though he lived on corn meal and milk, his constitution was wonderfully strong. He walked bare-headed at every funeral, taking no notice of rain, mire, or sunshine. He attended sick calls many miles away, and after riding over the prairies almost all night, would be at the altar next morning. If he were delayed, he would say Mass at any hour, going directly to the church on his return, and ringing the bells to give notice to his flock. His curious little buggy might often be seen flying over the prairies, for he always kept a fleet horse. But he was often obliged to go on foot where his horse could not carry him. Two days before he died he spent the night searching for a poor colored man that asked for his ministrations. The weather had been very wet. The prairie verdure was hidden in many places by muddy water. His steed, which the boys used to call "the lightning flash," could not "pull through" the mud, but the old man did. Leaving his turnout in a quagmire, he half waded, half dragged himself through the obstructions—and the writer is inclined to think that anybody who has not been in St. Martinsville in a rainy season knows not what mud is—he reached home coated with dirt and wet to the skin, and, after such a night, was on the altar in less than fifteen minutes.

In March, 1881, Père Jan founded St. Martin's Convent of Mercy, whose astonishing success he often declared to be the chief consolation of his old age. This was in a great measure due to his incessant exertions in its behalf, and the Sisters of Mercy mourned him as their kind father and best benefactor. They were glad to be able to ease him a little on their arrival by taking charge of the First Communion and Confirmation classes which, including "white, black and brown," numbered thousands, and with which he had never had help before.

When the bells, even those of the neighboring Protestant churches, announced the sad news of the death of this patriarch, the whole village mourned, business was suspended until after the funeral, stores and offices closed. While his remains lay in the church, hundreds touched them with beads and medals to preserve as relics. People spoke of miracles wrought by contact with his precious earthly tegument. And a hardened sinner who had publicly defied God and man, no sooner gazed on his sacred remains than he wept, and said: "I will make my peace with God as soon as a priest comes for the funeral."

A solemn *Requiem* was offered for him on August 17th, and his remains were laid beneath the sanctuary from which he had blessed and instructed his people for nearly forty years. The voice of the people proclaimed him a saint, and he certainly led the life of one

among them—a life of prayer, penance and labor. He was a man of splendid education and brilliant intellectual gifts, yet, for the love of God, he chose to wear out his life among poor Cayjuns and negroes. He had no congenial society; few, if any, of his parishioners were his equals intellectually. In manners he was a perfect gentleman, and was as courteous and gentle with the humblest of his flock as with the highest in the land. He had a remarkably strong countenance and a wealth of hair white as cotton bursting from the pod. He seldom wore a hat—the one he had was half as old as himself; his cassock was brown and threadbare; but though his plump figure was draped with an Indian blanket, it could not hide his distinguished air; the culture derived from the polished society in which the first half of his life was mostly spent remained to the last. And, however awed people were by his undoubted sanctity and his perfect devotion to "mankind of every description," especially the lowliest, the universal verdict was, "Père Jan is a gentleman—a real gentleman." And this from aristocrats of his flock who, while admitting that the king can make noblemen, declare that "it takes three hundred years to make a gentleman."

Save for God and his work, the loneliness of Père Jan's later years would have been terrible. His early friends, Lacordaire, Barat, Varin, and so many others, had all passed away. One of his pupils, the aged Bishop de Goesbriand, still survives. But they never met in America. How often must the old priest, amid the vast solitudes over which he roved alone under the midnight moon, in search of souls, fearless of the evil men[1] or beasts that infested them—how often must nature have sighed "for the touch of a vanished hand," and, still more, for "the sound of a voice that is still?" Or, rather, were not sufferings and privations joyous things to him who had borne the yoke of the Lord from his youth? Did he not realize a thousand-fold the truth of the beautiful promise: "Son, give me thy youth and I will guard thy old age?" Was he not able to say with the spouse in the Canticles: "All things, my beloved, the old and the new, I have kept for thee." No regret clouded the green and beautiful old age of this holy man. He

[1] Père Jan was utterly fearless in every way. On his first coming to St. Martinsville, his great devotedness to the colored, bound and free, was not relished by some of his aristocratic white parishioners. He told the writer that on several occasions men stood up in the church and drove their slaves from the Communion rail. They had evidently intimidated some of his predecessors. But Père Jan soon showed these people, whose gentlemanly propensities had been maturing for centuries, that the poorest slave was as much to him as the highest magnate, for it was only for the immortal soul he cared in each. They thought that negroes should not be allowed to kneel at the same railing as they, but Père Jan was no respecter of persons.

had given the whole substance of his house for love, and despised it all as nothing.

VIII.

Hitherto we have given sober history, but we cannot wholly forget that poetry and romance have cast their bewildering spells over the Attakapas. It is alive with weird and fantastic legends of the man-eating Indians, the early missions, and that beauteous flower of Acadie, Evangeline. For long stretches the solitude of the Tèche, whose meandering course lies through "the green Opelousas" and the fertile fields of St. Martin, is as unbroken as when her bark navigated its sluggish waters. It is spanned by arches of live oak and cypress, whose dark, thick foliage, draped with Spanish moss, gives the whole a melancholy yet most poetic aspect. The noise of engine and paddles seems strangely discordant on the silent river. The echoes of the "Canadian boat songs" of the men "who rowed through the midnight, silent at times," come down to us through the misty avenues of time. The trills and roulades of the mocking bird make the morning joyous. There is little undergrowth between the heavy trunks; but one frequently catches delicious vistas of the bright green and golden yellow of the cultivated fields beyond. Down to the water's edge grassy slopes in many places roll in graceful curves, and from out the cool shadows of numberless groves comes the sweetest forest music.

Towards St. Martinsville a sweep round a point of live oaks, "bearded like a pard," brought the boat to "Evangeline's Bend." The immortal trees that sheltered the cannibals and waved their branches to welcome the sad exiles of Acadie, lean lovingly over the bayou and embrace each other in the skies. One seems to be in a gorgeous cathedral, whose roof is interminable. The whispering winds, the dim religious light, the preternatural calm of these scenes, fresh from the hand of God, make this summer-land of intense sunshine and cool shadow and quivering moonlight glorious "beyond the muse's painting."

Around the oldest town on the Tèche poetry and romance will linger as long as our gentle troubadour's *Evangeline* survives, whether we regard that maiden as a beautiful creation of fiction, or, according to the traditions of these parts, a genuine heroine who lived, loved, and suffered, and, like the sweet-smelling balms of the east, gave out her fragrance only when her heart was broken. Upon the details of the heartless eviction of her people romance has lovingly seized and the poet has turned the magic light of his genius, till the gilded halo of song and story veils, as with a beauteous haze, the harsh outlines of sombre historic truth. Evangeline, with Father Felician, began her search for Gabriel, the silent

hero of the tale. They accompanied a band of exiles down the Mississippi, passed the Golden Coast, and entered Bayou Plaquemine. Her heart told her that

"Through these shadowy aisles had Gabriel wandered before her."

Tradition asserts that their meeting with Basil, the blacksmith, took place at St. Martinsville. In the first church[1] erected here she heard Father Felician's Mass ere she set out again on her sorrowful quest. In front of it was the *plaza* or square, still unfenced, and, save for a bronze statue of Père Jan,[2] unadorned, as when her dark eyes looked their last upon it. Around the church was the parish cemetery. Several graves and ruined tombs may still be seen to the right, though since the opening of a new cemetery—now an old one—no interments have been made near the church.

Our first glimpse of St. Martinsville was idyllic. The evening was of perfect clearness; the sun was setting slowly, and the young moon rising as we passed the old-fashioned draw-bridge, and moved upon the shiny waters beneath the shadows of hoary trees, garlanded with wreaths of gray moss. The repose of the scene was preternatural. Save the lowing of the Attakapas kine on the distant prairie, and the tinkling of the sheep-bells, no sound broke the solemn stillness. The white spire of the old church on its red base stood out finely against the darkening sky, the CROSS, which has stood aloft in this place for nearly a century and a half, keeping loving watch over all. It was high water, and everything on the banks was mirrored in the clear depths. We sang softly the Acadian hymn to the Sacred Heart of our Saviour. And the writer pledged herself to return to these fairy scenes by dipping her hand in the Tèche and tasting of its waters. For whoever drinks of these waters must revisit its umbrageous shores; yea, as a sterner proverb hath it, must return thither to die.

The cloisters of a Carthusian monastery are not more silent than St. Martinsville. A thriving outpost when most of the great cities of our country were not, it seems now, in the serene evening of life, dozing over the bright memories of the past. The broad dusty thoroughfares felt scarcely a footfall. The stores were open, but no one was in them. Around a strongly built brick church the town lies. The architecture is of a past era. Cottages shingle-roofed and bricked between the uprights, close Creole doors and shutters, an occasional tile roof—it was like stepping into the Attakapas capital some eighty years ago. On Sunday this other village of

[1] The old people say this church was afterwards burned.

[2] This statue was erected by the exertions of Père Jan's successor, Rev. A. B. Langlois, who, besides being an excellent priest, is an accomplished botanist.

Grand Pré shook off its slumberous spirit, and the charming mist of poesy seemed to evaporate. Hundreds of carriages arrive from all points of the prairie, pirogues anchor in the bayou, cavalcades of horsemen on Creole tackies come trouping in from the various roads in clouds of yellow dust, processions of bright-eyed children wind out of the convent gardens, and by 10 o'clock the spacious church is full of "white, black, and brown," summoned by the sweet-sounding quintette of bells of which the old place is proud. Mass does not begin directly. Père Jan is hearing confessions. About 11 High Mass begins. The choir is good, but the best voice in the village belongs to the saintly octogenarian.

No non-Catholic place of worship stands within the limits of St. Martinsville. It is, to a great extent, French in race and feeling, though not without Fitzgeralds, O'Rorkes and other names of Celtic origin, who, however, have long since been thoroughly Gallicized. New settlers have come with the railroad, and every one now speaks English. The women have discarded the Spanish mantilla, universal when the writer first knew St. Martinsville, and taken to modern millinery.

But nothing can rob the old place of the glamour of poesy that envelops it. Within the convent square is Evangeline's tree, a giant oak, from whose shade "the maiden descended down to the river's brink, where the boatmen were already waiting." Sometimes in the cool of even', when the moon is growing old, *on dit*, a slight figure with sad eyes and streaming hair is seen gliding among the shadows of this oak and among the ruined tombs of the ancient cemetery by the tall, red church. And the children hurry past these haunted spots with terror in their wide, dark eyes; even at noon, they say: "Perhaps Evangeline is under the convent oak, for she, too, was a Sister of Mercy." And, verily, when the moonbeams assume fantastic shapes, flitting among its shadows, imagination may easily create for us once more that fair girl, all in flowing white, her soft, black eyes gleaming through her nut-brown hair; and with true poetic feeling cordially would we welcome such a ghost. "Faded was she and old," says the poet, "when in disappointment her long journey ended." But never is Evangeline faded or old to us. To us she is always beautiful, and young, and "fair to behold, that maiden of seventeen summers." We see her in the summer of All Saints, "the sunshine of St. Eulalie," where "the simple Acadian farmers dwelt in the love of God and man." We see her on the flowery surf of the Attakapas prairie, now dotted with substantial plantation homes, and huge sugar-houses. We see her when the dying

> "Looked up into her face, and thought, indeed, to behold there
> Gleams of celestial light encircle her forehead with splendor."

We see her as a fair wraith ascending from her northern grave and revisiting the land of the cypress and myrtle.

And to this one fair spirit, so thoroughly Catholic, and so touchingly described in the exquisite imagery of the poet, more than to any belted knight or squire, the Church of the Attakapas owes the dreamy mist of poesy that floats about her groves and waters, and the halo that gleams from the oldest temple of God on the Attakapas prairies.

THE CONVERSION OF THE NORTHMEN.

IN the American Catholic Quarterly Review for April, 1888, we gave an account of the discoveries and colonies of the Northmen in the Western Hemisphere, commencing with the close of the tenth century; and we hinted at the influence these events had exerted upon the subsequent discovery of America by Columbus. As a fitting sequel we now propose to give the early religious and ecclesiastical history of these Northmen, and, in the near future, of the Norse Church on our continent during the same period. Our data are chiefly derived from the ancient Icelandic literature; but as much of the account is deduced from Papal Bulls, briefs, letters, and other Roman sources, may we not express the hope that this interesting subject, treated herein now for the first time as a separate and distinct study, may lead to a more thorough and complete elucidation of so attractive and important a branch of ecclesiastical history? We feel the more encouraged to express this hope here, since that illustrious Pope, scholar and author, who so gloriously and so ably fills the Papal chair, Leo XIII., has opened the treasures of the Vatican to the researches of the students, historians, scholars, and antiquarians of the world. There were two spots on the earth that held intercourse for five centuries with the distant and struggling colonies and Church of Greenland and Vinland. One of these was the frozen island, whose intrepid sons, the Vikings of Iceland, reached our shores in the tenth century, and planted there a commonwealth and a Christian Church; the other was Rome, mother of nations and of churches, whose Pontiffs provided that most distant and forlorn portion of the Universal Church with a succession of seventeen bishops, and when overwhelmed with disaster struggled to revive the Church and episcopate of Green-

land. It is to the former that we are indebted for that rich and beautiful Icelandic literature which first gave the modern world the earliest and authentic accounts of the voyages, the discoveries, the colonies, and the heroic deeds of the Northmen in America. Thus, from the traditional histories and epics of the Saga-men and Scalds of Iceland, subsequently reduced to writing by the monks of the frozen island, the *Ultima Thule* of the ancients, collected together, carefully compiled, and handsomely published by the Royal Society of Northern Antiquarians, by the labors of the European Societies of Americanists, and other learned bodies, aided by the governments of Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, we have received accessions to the history of our race of the rarest, most instructive, reliable and authentic character. So, too, we must also turn to the Roman archives, to the treasures of the Vatican, now so generously made accessible to the world by Pope Leo XIII., for the details of the ecclesiastical history of the Northmen in America, so far as the same may be contained in Papal bulls, briefs, and letters, and in the reports and relations of the bishops and missionaries who took part in the conversion of the barbarians of the north of Europe, and in forming their missions, churches, and episcopal sees. There is one subject more especially, now most imperfectly explored and involved in doubt and confusion, which is the episcopate of the western hemisphere, involving the exact names of the seventeen or eighteen bishops, the dates of their appointments, the exact order of succession, their history and services to the cause of Christianity, what reports they made to Rome, when and where and by whom consecrated, their deaths and burials, and the churches which they founded. Of Bishop Eric, the first bishop, the one who is said to have come to America and preached the Gospel, and sealed his preaching with his blood among the aborigines of our country, the least is known. Of the others, we can approximate to the order of succession and other particulars; but we possess no detailed or complete history in respect to most of them. It is not improbable that Eric, the first, may not have been the only Greenland bishop to visit our country and announce the glad tidings to the "Skraelings" of his day. The Roman archives would certainly go far to clear up our doubts and to supply the deficiencies in our earliest ecclesiastical history.

The Northmen were an ancient Asiatic tribe, and it is probable, according to Tacitus among ancient authors, and M. Mallet among moderns, that they, as all the ancient tribes and clans into which mankind were dispersed after the confusion of tongues at the Tower of Babel, originally worshipped the one true God. It is thought by learned antiquarians that they worshipped God chiefly and were free from polytheism; even after they had defeated the

French under Rollo, and had under that same general conquered Norway, they preserved traces of this *cultus* in the midst of their paganism. Their more immediate origin was Gothic. The religion and ceremonies of the Scandinavians was peculiar to themselves; and throughout the degeneration and corruptions of their mythology preserved some traces of their former worship of the true God, and their religion always bore some resemblance to Christianity. The doctrine of future responsibility was preserved by them, and they believed in future rewards and punishments. At first and in the abyss of ages, according to their pagan mythology, all things were chaotic, and without form or life, and darkness was upon the face of the deep; but by the operation of the warmth upon the chaotic mass the giant Ymer sprang forth into life. Then Odin, who is believed to have been originally a true historical personage when divested of his subsequent mythical character, having come from Asgard on the river Don (Tanais), in southern Russia, slew Ymer and his entire offspring; the bad and evil Jetters and Thyrsers (giants) were drowned in the stream of blood that proceeded from the corpse of the murdered Ymer, except one giant who propagated the evil generation of Jetters or Thyrsers, and lived in perpetual enmity with gods and men. Odin then became the supreme deity. Of Ymer's body, as related by the old Scandinavian *Sagas*, Odin moulded and framed the ordained and settled world with mountains, rivers, lakes, trees, and clouds, and the skull of Ymer formed the vault of heaven, and therein he placed the celestial luminaries of the great ash-tree, Yggdrasill, whose topmost branches were said to dance eternally in the heavenly light; he formed the first human beings, Arkur and Embla, who resided in Midgard, and from whom are descended the whole human race. The gods themselves lived in Asgard, close to Upsala, in Sweden. Odin was superior to all other gods, and it was his wife and children that formed the inferior yet powerful deities of the universe. He was the father of gods and men, and ruled the world by his wisdom and prudence, contemplating and viewing all things from his heavenly seat and royal palace in the Valhalla of the Scandinavians, the Hlidskjalf. Yet he was a fearful and remorseless god, and of him it was written, "the terrible and severe god; the father of slaughter; he who giveth victory and reviveth courage in the conflict; who nameth those that are to be slain." Warriors going into battle made a vow to send a certain number of souls, which they consecrated to him; they were his right; he received them at Valhalla, his ordinary place of residence, where he rewarded all such as died sword in hand, and admitted them to sit and feast at his sumptuous table. Odin even descended at times, and mingled in earthly battles.

He inflamed the fury of the combatants, he struck those that were destined to perish, and carried their souls to his celestial abode. The principal goddess among the Scandinavians was Frigga, the wife of Odin, who seems to correspond with the goddess Earth of the Greeks, Romans and Phœnicians. The prose and verse *Eddas*, the ancient Scandinavian account of their mythology, say that Frigga was a most benign goddess, and yet she went to war as well as Odin, and divided with him the souls of the slain. She was also the goddess of pleasure; and although the Scandinavian deities abstained from the loves of the Greek and Roman gods, she is supposed to have occupied the same position in heaven that Venus did with the more cultivated, though less virtuous, nations of the earth. The second principal god was Thor, who was a son of Odin, and the most valiant of his sons, the defender and avenger of the gods, and the destroyer of giants and monsters, their enemies. He became more especially the favorite deity of Norway, where he received many of the attributes of Odin, became the god of war for that country, and was most ardently worshipped by the warlike Northmen. His mallet or hammer was his favorite weapon, with which he struck dead his enemies; as often as he discharged it, it returned to his hand, which held it with iron gauntlets, and it had the power of renewing and imparting to him a godlike strength. The Danes especially paid the highest honors to Odin; the inhabitants of Norway and Iceland appear to have been under the immediate protection of Thor, and the Swedes had chosen for their titular deity Kreyja, or rather Trey, who, according to the *Edda*, presided over the seasons of the year, and bestowed peace, fertility and riches. There were, in fact, twelve gods and as many goddesses, to whom divine honors were due, who, though they had all a certain power, were nevertheless obliged to obey Odin as the most ancient of the gods, and the great principle of all things. Among these lesser deities were Njord, the Neptune of the north; Baldur, the god of wisdom and eloquence; Tyr, another warlike god, the patron of brave men; Bragi, who presided over poetry, and his wife Iduna, who guarded the mystic fruit which renewed the perpetual youth of the gods. The porter of the heavens was Heimdall, who guarded the bridge (the rainbow) between heaven and earth, and who was stationed at one end thereof, and provided with a sword to prevent the giants and enemies of the gods from crossing it, and with a trumpet whose notes resounded through all the worlds; he also was gifted with the faculty of sleeping lightly, and with such delicate sense of hearing that he could hear the grass grow in the fields and the wool grow on the backs of the sheep. There was also the god Soki, the evil principle and calumniator of the gods; among his

numerous children were the wolf Fenrir, the serpent Midgard, and Hela, or Death. Besides the twelve goddesses, of whom Frigga, the wife of Odin, was the chief, there were three Fates called Nornas, who, under Odin, determined the lives and deaths of men; and the maidens of Odin, called Valkyrjers, who were continually rushing through the ether, seeking in all countries the bravest heroes, whom they marked with their spear-point when the hour of death had come. The Scandinavians had their oracles, divinations, auspices, presages, lots and other superstitions, and carried these follies to as great an excess as any other heathen people. There were two different abodes for the happy; one was Valhalla, the palace of Odin, where he received all who died from violence and valiantly from the beginning to the end of the world; the other was called Gimli, the palace covered with gold, where the just were to enjoy eternal happiness. So also there were two places of future punishment; the first of these was named Niflheim, and was only to continue to the final renovation of the world, or the last judgment; and the other was called Náströnd, the shore of the dead, and was eternal in duration and punishment. This belief of a continual and immediate action of the Supreme Divinity on all creatures, and in the power of the Fates to determine all human events, and that at his birth every man had his destiny and duration of life fixed by an inferior deity assisting at his birth, made the Scandinavians not only the most immovable stoics, but also the most inveterate fatalists. Hence their ruling passion was for war. They had a blind temerity and a predominant recklessness in meeting tortures and death. It was believed that a hero's life might be prolonged if any one else would put himself in his place and die in his stead, and that Odin, appeased by such a sacrifice, revoked the decree of the destinies and prolonged the life of the one who was so fortunate as to thus have a willing substitute at the hour of death. Whatever the passions or impulses of a Northman prompted him to do, however sudden, unjust, cruel or reckless, was right when done, because all things done were fore-ordained. Piracy, murder, suicide, relentless war, and whatever gave vent and gratification to their passions, were not only common with the Scandinavians, but in fact constituted their glory and their happiness. The case of Charles XII., of Sweden, in more recent times, illustrates how men can become possessed with the hereditary fatalism of the Northmen, and care not for danger and meet fate with immovable temerity. Such a religion left but little room for moral precepts, and yet it inculcated besides intrepidity in war, the service of the gods and the offering of sacrifices to them; that men should not be unjust; should extend hospitality to strangers; should be faithful to the marriage vow, and keep their word inviolable. In

Valhalla the heroes, called Einheriars, passed their time every day in the pleasure of arming themselves, marshalling themselves in military order, fighting and knocking down one another; but in the evening they got upon their feet again and returned to Valhalla, where Odin had a grand feast prepared for them, consisting of the flesh of the wild boar, which, though butchered every day, returned again to life to be slaughtered each day for the happy; and at the feast the Valkyrjers, Odin's beautiful virgins, presented to them the celestial mead to drink from the curved horns, until they were all in a state of utter intoxication. It seems that Wormius, Bartholin and other writers were mistaken in supposing that they drank their mead from "*the skulls of our enemies*," and in so translating the language of the *Edda*, as has been demonstrated by Finn Magnusen and professor Rafn. And Southey was mistaken in following the impression of the older writers when he wrote:

> "They thought
> One day from Ella's skull to quaff the mead,
> Their valour's guerdon."

The passage in the Icelandic prose *Edda* which gave rise to this question of drinking their mead from the skulls of their enemies, is as follows, and it, at the same time, illustrates the sentiments which caused the Scandinavians to make war their business and to carry their valor to the utmost excesses of fanaticism. The passage in question gives the language of King Ragnar Lodbrok at the moment of his death: "We are cut to pieces with swords; but this fills me with joy, when I think of the feast that is preparing for me in Odin's palace. Quickly, quickly seated in the splendid habitation of the gods, *we shall drink beer out of curved horns.* A brave man fears not to die. I shall utter no timorous words as I enter the Hall of Odin." The Scandinavian gods were worshipped partly in the open air, in groves, or places encompassed by a circle of big stones, partly in wooden temples, among which that in Upsala, in Sweden, was the most famous. The public worship was generally conducted by the heads of families, and here sacrifices were the chief feature, the usual victims being horses, oxen, young swine, hawks and cocks. Before Odin conquered the north, human victims were offered in sacrifice to the gods, and the people were not free from cannibalism in more ancient times. Festivals were held in honor of the gods, the principal one being the Yule Feast, which afterwards became the Christmas of the Northmen. The days of the week were named after the gods, and to this day we have in our own English calendar four days of the week which are yet named after the heathen deities of the Northmen: Tuesday is named after the Scandina-

navian god Tyr, Wednesday is named after the god Odin or Woden, Thursday is named after the god Thor, and Friday is named after the goddess Frigga or Fria, the wife of Odin.

But the dominion of the gods of Valhalla was not to last forever. In the end "the world was to be judged by righteousness," and this was to happen when Loki, the evil deity, succeeded in killing Baldur, the wisest of the gods of Valhalla and their defender; then a new earth would arise from the ocean, and the Almighty God could descend to judge men in righteousness. The good and true could enter the golden palace of Odin, Gimli, illumined by the light proceeding from the countenance of Odin, to live forever in happiness and in companionship with the gods themselves, then purified by fire. But the evil, such as perjurers, murderers and seducers, were to be cast down into Náströnd to suffer in eternal fire. Heroism, in a pagan sense, was the highest of all virtues. Woman was respected and defended among them, and she was, to a great degree, regarded as man's equal and companion; her virtue was defended, and seducers and adulterers were dealt with in the severest manner. Woman had as great a passion for war as man, and no young man could win the hand and heart of the Norse virgin unless he had gained some renown in war. Drinking was a prevalent custom, almost a religious observance, with the Scandinavians, for at religious festivals and celebrations they drank to the gods in succession, and their Yule Feast or Christmas was kept with high revelry. While the earth, water, fire, air, sun, moon and stars, and even trees, forests, rivers, mountains, rocks, winds, thunder and tempests, had their respective deities, the Scandinavians always recognized and worshipped one deity as superior to all, the rewarder of the good and the punisher of the wicked.

The following historical scenes and incidents will illustrate more effectually than a mythological treatise the practical effect of their religion upon the character and conduct of the Northmen, their courage and their contempt of death, the lawless piracy they practised, and the manner in which prisoners were treated. In the year 994 took place the piratical expedition of the Jomsburg sea-rovers, the Spartans of Scandinavia, along the coast of Norway; the following account is taken from the pages of Mallet's "Northern Antiquities": "Sailing along the coast of Norway with a powerful fleet, they signalized their approach by plundering, burning, killing all the men capable of bearing arms, and by the perpetration of all those other revolting and remorseless deeds which, in those ages, invariably marked the progress of a band of Scandinavian freebooters. The crafty Norwegian, Jarl Hakon, having in the meantime collected his forces, sailed with a fleet of one hundred and fifty vessels, and fell in with the Jomsburg fleet at a place called Hjo-

rungavag (now Lievog), and at break of day a combat began, which was maintained by the sea-rovers with their accustomed valor, though they were greatly inferior in numbers to the Norwegians. Hakon, in fact, after trying in vain to break through the line of his opponent, found it prudent to retire with his fleet to the coast, and we are told that he then went into a forest to consult a famous sorceress, or prophetess, called Thorgerd Hordabrud, in whom he put all his trust in any great emergency. She was, however, for a long time deaf to his supplications for assistance, although Hakon prostrated himself on the earth before her and offered to perform any bloody sacrifice she might require. She at length told him that the victory could only be obtained by the sacrifice of his son Erling, a very handsome boy, then in his seventh year. Hakon did not hesitate to offer up his son, and then returned to his fleet and renewed the engagement. Towards evening a dreadful thunderstorm arose, during which hailstones of an unusual size fell on board the Jomsburg vessels. The sea-rovers also fancied that they saw Thorgerd Hordabrud herself at the prow of Hakon's ship, with whole volleys of arrows flying from her fingers, each arrow bringing to one of them his death-wound. Twenty-five of the Jomsburg ships had already fallen into the hands of the Norwegians, when Sigvald cut the cable by which the remainder were fastened together, and bidding the other chieftians follow him, sailed away from the combat, saying that he had made a vow to fight against men and not against witches. Meanwhile, Hakon and his son Eirek boarded the vessel of Bui the Thick, and when that chieftain saw that further resistance was fruitless, he took two chests of gold, and calling out, "Overboard all Bui's men," plunged with his treasure in the sea and perished. Thorkell and Sigurd then took to flight and arrived in Denmark with thirty vessels. Vagn, however, continued to fight valiantly with his division against the combined forces of the Norwegians, but was at length overpowered and taken prisoner with thirty of his followers.

"The next morning, when Hakon and his sons had breakfasted, they ordered the prisoners to be led to execution. The proceedings on this occasion show, at the same time, the barbarity of the age and the kind of heroism which was more the result of this barbarity than of the pretended legislation of Palnatoki. The prisoners being seated on a log of wood with their legs bound together by a rope, withes or osier twigs were twisted in their hair. A slave was then placed behind each to keep his head steady by holding fast the withes twisted into a band for that purpose. The executioner was no less a personage than Thorkell Leire, one of the most renowned Norwegian chieftains, whose daughter Vagn had vowed to gain possession of without the consent of her relations.

Thorkell began his sanguinary task by striking off the head of him who sat outmost on the log. After he had beheaded the next two he asked the prisoners what they thought of death. 'What happened to my father,' replied one, 'must happen to me. He died, so must I.' Another said that he remembered too well the laws of Jomsburg to fear dying; a third declared that a glorious death was ever welcome to him, and that such a death was far more preferable than an infamous life like that of Thorkell's. 'I only beg of thee,' said a fourth, 'to be quick over thy work, for thou must know that it is a question often discussed at Jomsburg whether or not a man feels anything after losing his head. I will therefore grasp this knife in my hand; if, after my head is cut off, I throw it at thee, it will show that I still retain some feeling; if I let it fall, it will prove just the contrary. Strike, therefore, and decide the question without further delay.' Thorkell, says the Saga-man, struck off the man's head with a stroke of his battle-axe, but the knife instantly fell to the ground. 'Strike the blow in my face,' said the next, 'I will sit still without flinching, and take notice whether I even wink my eyes; for we Jomsburg people know how to meet the strike of death without betraying an emotion.' He kept his promise, and received the blow without showing the least sign of fear, or so much as winking his eyes. Sigurd, the son of Bui the Thick, a fine young man in the flower of his age, with long fair hair as fine as silk, flowing in ringlets over his shoulders, said, in answer to Thorkell's question, 'I fear not death, since I have fulfilled the greatest duty of life, but I must pray thee not to let my hair be touched by a slave or stained with my blood.' One of Hakon's followers then stepped forward and held his hair instead of the slave, but when Thorkell struck the blow, Sigurd twitched his head forward so strongly that the warrior who was holding his hair had both his hands cut off. Eirek, the son of Jarl Hakon, who seemed to have relished this practical joke, then came up and asked Sigurd whether he would have his life spared. 'That depends,' replied the youth, 'upon who it is that makes me the offer.' 'He who has the power to do it, Jarl Eirek,' said the son of the Norwegian chieftain. 'From his hand will I accept it,' said Sigurd, and he was immediately loosed from the rope. Thorkell, enraged at Eirek's clemency, exclaimed: 'If thou spare the lives of all these men, Jarl, at least Vagn Akason shall not escape me.' So saying, he ran at Vagn with uplifted axe, but the crafty sea-rover threw himself on the ground so Thorkell fell over him and cut the rope with his axe, seeing which, Vagn sprang up, and seizing the weapon, gave Thorkell his death-wound. Jarl Eirek, notwithstanding his father's remonstrances, then asked Vagn if he would accept life from his hands. 'Willingly,' replied Vagn, 'pro-

vided thou wilt give it to all of us.' 'Loose the rope,' said Eirek, and it was done; eighteen had been beheaded and twelve were spared by Eirek thus interfering, among whom was a Welshman named Bjorn. After this the army dispersed. Jarl Hakon went to Drontheim, highly dissatisfied with his son's proceedings. Jarl Eirek, however, does not seem to have cared much for his father's displeasure, for we are told that he shortly afterward married Vagn to Thorkell Leire's daughter Ingjibjörg, the young lady, be it remembered, whom the sea-rovers had vowed to gain possession of without her friends' consent, and whose father he had actually killed. However, such events were of frequent occurrence in those turbulent ages, and would not be regarded as singular. Vagn, after his marriage, returned to Denmark with three ships, which Eirek had made him a present of, and became a renowned chieftain and the founder of a powerful family.

"Sigvald, on his arrival at Jomsburg, was received very coolly by his fair lady, Astrida, who jeered him ever afterwards for returning from a battle without a single wound, an action which in her eyes was quite unpardonable."

The conversion of such a people to Christianity was no easy task. The arguments of force, power, courage and human glory were more powerful with them than dogma, faith, or sanctity. The arbitrament of the sword was their *ultima ratio.* Appealing to war, as they did on all occasions, and for the settlement of all disputes, they abided by the harsh yet unappealable result, and when the cross and the sword came together they accepted the one when, and when only, they could not overcome the power of the other. This was the only power that had any influence with them. When vanquished at arms, they acquiesced in the adoption of the new religion at the mandate of king or parliament. In Norway, more than in any other Scandinavian country, the struggle between Christianity and paganism was conducted on the field of battle, and thus civil war prevailed until the cross of Christ overcame the mallet of Thor.

In those early days, both the Church and the State took an active part in the spread of the Gospel among heathen nations. Emperor and Pontiff went forward in measures for the evangelization of the pagan peoples of the north of Europe, and thus it was that Charlemagne, Louis his son, and their successors, on the one hand, and Gregory IV. and Leo IV., and the Pontiffs of that immediate age, on the other hand, stand forth as prominent actors in the conquests of the Christian faith. We do not read of formal concordats in the times of the Charlemagnes, or of the Ethelberts and Louises, for in those days it was a question of doing the most with munificent hand and pious heart for the advancement of re-

ligion, by Roman Pontiffs and by the Christian nations, among their pagan and heathen neighbors, the rude and barbarous nations of the North. The age of the concordats marks the time when, among Christian nations and with Christian kings, princes and emperors, it became necessary to stipulate by treaty for the conservation, protection, and defence of the interests of religion in the Christian states themselves. Struggles between Ghibellines and Guelphs belong to a later period in the history of the world and of the Church, and these struggles have led to the negotiation of many a concordat between Pope and Potentate, the Ghibelline representing the imperial and feudal hierarchy, the Guelph representing the Church and national independence.

But in the earlier period, of which we are now writing, the mild and peaceful measures and counsels of the Pontiffs of Rome had not unfrequently to restrain the impetuous methods and measures of the newly-converted Christian kings and princes. For it was not an uncommon thing for missionary expeditions to the middle and north of Europe in those days to be accompanied with military outfits and armies of organized and national character, bent at once on the religious conversion and civil subjugation of the invaded peoples. Thus, it is undoubtedly true that the cross and the sword went together in the gigantic work of converting, forming, and cementing together the Christendom of the Middle Ages. An instance of this kind, out of many recorded in the chronicles of those days, will be given hereafter as a part of the more immediate history we are going to relate concerning the conversion of the Northmen, whose mariners and vikings, whose priests and bishops, were the first to discover and the first to evangelize the continent of America. It is also undoubtedly true that more than one of the Roman Pontiffs, influenced by the mild and gentle precepts of the Apostolic faith, had to restrain and condemn this method of propagating the Gospel among heathen nations by force, and more than one illustrious Pope issued his Bull to forbid, in express terms, the sending of military expeditions into heathen lands for the propagation of the Christian faith. Such expeditions were more or less in keeping with the spirit of that early age, with the condition, customs, and necessities of the times, and with the indomitable and unanswerable argument of brute force, which was the only principle for which many of the barbarous nations of that day, such as the Northmen, themselves pre-eminently so, had the slightest respect. And it is a curious feature, witnessed in the history of those days, that the parliament and king of a brave and fearless people would by edict or statute, enacted in a single day, change absolutely the religion of the nation and the people. The principle that Christian faith is a free and voluntary

act of the will and conscience, which cannot be coerced, which cannot be created or annihilated by force, seems to have been better understood at Rome than in the palaces of the rude but chivalrous kings, and in the legislative halls, of that strong and robust era of the world, for it was from Rome that the Pontiffs issued their edicts against the propagation of the Christian faith among heathen nations by force.

The Christian kings and emperors of the eighth, ninth, and tenth centuries, with the consent of, or by some privilege sanctioned by, the Holy See, took an active part in the historic progress of the Church. Not only did they sit or be represented in the general councils of the Church, a right which seems to have ceased only with the Council of the Vatican, but they founded sees and dioceses within their dominions, and sent their nominees for the episcopacy either to Rome or to some neighboring archbishop or bishop for consecration. Such was the accord between the Church and the Christian state. Pontiff and king united in the great work of Christianizing the world. It was thus that Pope Gregory, in his Bull to St. Ansgar, to which we are about to refer more fully, makes special mention of the intention entertained by Charlemagne in his lifetime of supplying the northern nations with missionaries and bishops, and Louis, his successor and son, divided the whole territory beyond the Elbe between two neighboring bishops, Villeric of Bremen and Herigald of Werden; and it is related that Louis, remembering the intentions of his illustrious father, and with the consent of the bishops and of a numerous council, established an archiepiscopal see at Hamburg, for the purpose of sending bishops and priests to the regions north of the Elbe and the other northern countries. He selected as the missionary bishop of the northern countries St. Ansgar, and in 832 sent him to be consecrated as Archbishop of Hamburg by Drogan, Bishop of Metz, who was brother of the Emperor Louis and son of Charlemagne, in the presence of three archbishops, Ebbon of Rheims, Hetti of Treves, and Olgard of Mentz, and several bishops, including the bishops of Bremen and Werden; all of whom took part in the consecration of St. Ansgar, in token of their sanction. The Emperor Louis then sent St. Ansgar to Rome with letters to Pope Gregory IV. asking his formal approval. The Pope testified his approval by a decree, gave St. Ansgar the *pallium*, and named him and Ebbon, Archbishop of Rheims, as Apostolic Legates of the Swedes, Danes, and other northern nations, for St. Ansgar had previously preached the Gospel among those northern peoples, and had won the title of Apostle of the North. Pope Gregory IV., at the tomb of St. Peter, gave him authority to preach the Gospel publicly, and pronounced an anathema on any one who should

dare to throw obstacles in his way. This account is taken almost verbatim from the contemporaneous biographer of St. Ansgar. Hamburg, the episcopal city of St. Ansgar, was burned in 845 by the Normans, and the saint spent himself in his efforts to support his desolate churches. In 849, the see of Bremen becoming vacant, the Pope united the sees of Hamburg and Bremen, and appointed St. Ansgar metropolitan of the united dioceses. While St. Ansgar was simply a priest, Harold, prince of Denmark, then on a visit to the Emperor Louis, became converted and was baptized at the imperial court. St. Ansgar, under the protection and authority of the prince, went to the north as missionary, and succeeded in introducing Christianity, first into Denmark, and then into Sweden; for, under the princely authority and power, little ceremony was observed in overturning the altars of Odin and Thor when the people themselves refused to do so. But St. Ansgar's mission was one of peace and persuasion. On his return to receive episcopal consecration, he left many apostolic missionaries in the northern countries to continue the great work he had commenced. On his return to the north as Archbishop of Hamburg and Bremen, he found that Denmark and Sweden had relapsed into paganism and idolatry. In Denmark, finding in King Hovick a friend of the Christian religion, the people yielded to the royal pleasure and the zealous appeals of the saint. But in Sweden the superstitious King Olas, against the remonstrances of St. Ansgar, who refused to sanction the decision of the cause of God and of religion by the cast of a die, insisting that the issue be left to the care of Heaven, persisted in ordering that lots be cast to determine whether the Apostolic missionary and his companions should be admitted into the country. The cast of the lots proved favorable to Ansgar and his cause; he entered the country and evangelized it with his characteristic zeal and success; he converted many among the ranks of the people, and founded many churches, which he left under zealous pastors on his return to Bremen. Of this great Apostle of the North Dr. Alban Butler writes: "He wore a rough hair shirt, and, whilst his health permitted him, contented himself with a small quantity of bread and water. He never undertook anything without recommending it first to God by earnest prayer, and had an extraordinary talent for preaching. His charity to the poor had no bounds; he washed their feet, and waited on them at table. He ascribed it to his sins that he had never met with the glory of martyrdom in all that he had suffered for the faith. To excite himself to compunction, and to the divine praise, he made a collection of pathetic sentences, some of which he placed at the end of each psalm, several of which are found in certain manuscript psalters, as Fleury takes notice. The learned Fabricius, in his Latin

library of the Middle Ages, calls them an illustrious monument of this holy prelate."

St. Ansgar had succeeded in introducing Christianity into Denmark and Sweden, and, although many vestiges of paganism remained, he lived to enjoy the happiness of seeing his apostolic labors bearing abundant fruit. But the less tractable Norwegians still remained engulfed in ancient idolatry and superstition. In the middle of the ninth century, King Harold Harfaga, of Norway, publicly renounced the worship of Odin and the other Scandinavian gods, long before Christianity was introduced, and prohibited piracy, one of the favorite occupations of the Northmen. He completed the conquest of Norway in 880. Rollo conquered and founded the province of Normandy in France, became Christian in 912, bequeathed Normandy to his descendants, and gave a dynasty of Norse kings to England. In 940, Hakon the Good endeavored, in vain, to induce his countrymen, the Northmen of Norway, to adopt the Christian faith. He had been educated at the court of Athelstan of England, his foster-father, and was a Christian. Returning to Norway, notwithstanding his faith he was elected king. When offered the royal mead in crooked horns, to drink at his coronation, he is said to have made upon it the sign of the cross; but his countrymen noticing this, one of his wily courtiers parried all further inquiry by alleging that the king had made the sign of the crossed mallets of Thor, and Hakon weakly connived at the evasion. But this unfortunate prince, though he remained at heart attached to the doctrines of Christ, shrank from avowing them openly to his nobles and people, and united with them in offering sacrifices to Odin and the other heathen gods. Better had he remained and died a pensioner on the bounty of the English king. As he lay dying, after the battle of Stord, he once more avowed his true convictions and said: "Were a longer life allowed me, I would go to Christian men and pray for pardon of my sins against God; but I have lived a heathen and as a heathen must be buried; lay me, therefore, where ye shall judge best."

King Olaf Tryggvason was the champion of Christianity in Norway, and introduced it into that country about the close of the tenth and beginning of the eleventh centuries. His reign and that of his successor, Saint Olaf, also king of Norway, are striking illustrations of the zeal of the early Christian converts in that rude age and among the warlike nations of the North. Olaf Tryggvason devoted his entire reign to the propagation of Christianity in Norway. The methods adopted by the two Olafs to convert the country were peculiar; and as the accounts of their lives were written by Icelandic monks, and their reigns stand forth in glory in the history of their times and country, and as the means they adopted were in conformity with the manner in which other

northern countries had been evangelized in those early ages, there can be no doubt of the correctness of the narratives. The first Olaf travelled from district to district of Norway, accompanied by a band of holy and eloquent Christian missionaries, and at the same time by a strong body of trained soldiers. The first thing he did was to summon the Thing, or local parliament, or court of the people, to assemble, and he gave them the alternative of fighting or receiving baptism. As few of such districts were prepared to meet so formidable an army as the king's, they generally acquiesced and accepted baptism and the faith from the hands of the missionaries. To such as became converted he extended unbounded favor and protection; but to the recusants he showed no mercy, either in their persons or their estates. Of this king, and of the methods adopted by him and others for extending the Gospel in the North, the following passage occurs in an able article in the *Dublin Review* of December, 1847. "The romantic, but, we think, well authenticated, Saga of Olaf Tryggvason tells us that the mild sway of Christ was at length forced with the sword upon the heathen Vikings of Norway. For a mission accompanied with violence, no apology can be made, but some allowance must be given for the warlike spirit of the age, where personal strength and the sharp sword were the strongest arguments with a comparatively illiterate people."

The following incident throws light upon the character of King Olaf and his methods, upon the customs of the Northmen, and shows that Olaf, in one instance at least, used persuasion rather than force to make converts. Two distinguished Icelanders, Kjartan and Bolli, being on a visit in their ships to Norway for pleasure and trade, arrived on one fine autumn day at the harbor of Drontheim, and, joining in the favorite amusement of the people there, took part in the swimming and aquatic exercises. Kjartan, making up to one of the most dexterous of the Norwegian swimmers, succeeded in ducking him under the water. The Norwegian on rising succeeded in ducking in turn the Icelander, and so the two champion swimmers continued for some time to display their strength and agility, amid the cheers of the spectators, until it was decided they were fully a match for each other. On coming to land the Norwegian asked Kjartan who he was and whether he was as expert in other feats as he had shown himself to be at swimming.

"If people in Iceland did not rate my other qualities higher than my swimming," coldly replied Kjartan, "I should not have much to boast of."

"That depends upon whom thou hast for a competitor," said the Norwegian; "and methinks thou mightst condescend to inquire the name of the person thou hast now been contending with."

"It is a matter of perfect indifference to me," replied Kjartan, "what thy name may be."

"By my troth, 'tis a hardy fellow I have to deal with!" exclaimed the Norwegian; "but although thou art too proud to ask, I will tell thee my name—know, then, that it is Olaf Tryggvason thou hast been swimming with."

Kjartan, making no answer, hurried in his swimming attire to his ship, when King Olaf called him back, and taking off his rich scarlet mantle, placed it on the shoulders of the Icelander, saying: "There, as thou hast now no occasion to fear taking cold, thou needst not be in such a hurry to leave me!"

King Olaf was at this time in the third year of his reign; he had already succeeded in converting his courtiers, and at a Thing (parliamentary assembly of the people), then recently held since Kjartan's arrival, had managed to persuade most of the inhabitants of Drontheim to accept baptism. He had laid an embargo on three of the Icelandic vessels belonging to Kjartan's party lying in the harbor of Drontheim on account of their crews refusing to embrace Christianity and receive baptism, and he gave all the Icelanders there to understand that they should not set sail until they too had accepted baptism. The Icelanders were indignant; they reproached Kjartan for accepting the royal mantle from the king, which they regarded as equivalent to acknowledging himself in the royal service; they held a meeting on board their ships to consider the king's ultimatum. Bolli declared his disinclination "to embrace such effeminate doctrines as those of Christianity appeared to be." But Kjartan surprised them all by the audacity of his proposal, for, rising in the meeting, he said:

"And I am of the opinion that instead of sitting here to be taken like sheep in a fold, and compelled, as these poor Norwegians have been, to kneel before a kirtled monk, we should do better to fall on King Olaf, and burn him in his palace."

This plan, though highly approved, was deemed too hazardous, and after a long discussion the meeting "*adjourned sine die*," as we Americans would say, without arriving at any conclusion. The king, who had been fully informed of the meeting by his spies, next day summoned the Icelanders to his presence, and told them he was fully determined to make them Christians before they left Drontheim, and added that he was well aware that one of their number had proposed to burn him to death in his palace. Whereupon Kjartan unhesitatingly avowed that it was he who had made the proposal.

"Well, this time I will not punish thee," said the king, "and as ye are averse to the doctrines of Christianity, ye may depart in peace, for the God we worship does not wish that any one should be brought to Him by compulsion."

"In this manner," replied Kjartan, "I may be induced to become a Christian; and at all events will promise that next winter, in Iceland, Thor shall not often be worshipped by me."

The Icelanders tarried at Drontheim till Christmas, the Yule feast of the Scandinavians, and they all attended a solemn midnight Mass, at which the monks produced the most imposing and the grandest ceremonies and music of the Church, and at which King Olaf delivered one of his most earnest and eloquent homilies on the Christian faith. Hereupon the Icelanders in a body declared their readiness to become Christians and receive baptism, and the ceremony was performed on the spot. England had already become Catholic, and much commercial intercourse had been going on between that country and Iceland, and through the channels of commerce many English monks and missionaries had for years visited Iceland and to a considerable extent familiarized the Icelanders with Christianity, and made many converts. Before its discovery by the Norwegians, Iceland had become a place of retreat and religious seclusion for English and Irish monks and anchorites, for it is related in the Icelandic "Landanama Book," one of the most ancient and most authentic historical authorities, that in 875, when the Norwegian Ingolf and the first Norwegian settlers went to Iceland, "there were here Christian people, whom the Northmen called *Papas*, but they afterwards went away because they would not be here among heathens; and left behind them Irish books and bells, and croziers (crosses), from which it could be seen that they were Irishmen." English writers, including the Venerable Bede, and the Saga of King Olaf Tryggvason, make mention of the same. So that after the conversion of the Icelanders at the midnight Mass at Drontheim, Kjartan proposed to go with his trading vessel to England, having heard that Scandinavians, who had renounced heathenism and embraced Christianity, were favorably received in that country. King Olaf told him he would have preferred his returning to Icelend and preaching Christianity there; but at all events the king would wish him to remain with him and become one of the leading attendants at his court. Kjartan, receiving handsome presents from the king, including a court-dress, one of the king's own suits, which, as they were of the same size, fitted him admirably, became a courtier at the throne of Olaf Tryggvason. The king then sent his court-chaplain, Thangbrand, to convert the Icelanders, but the Icelandic Scalds and Saga-men so ridiculed his religion and his mission that he returned to Norway without success. King Olaf then put an embargo on all Icelandic vessels in Norway, and sent two Icelandic converts and exiles, Hjalti and Gissur, to Iceland to convert the country, retaining Kjartan and three other Icelanders as hostages for their

safety. This was in the summer of the year of Our Lord 1000, and such was the success of the zealous converts and missionaries, that in that same year of grace Christianity, by the solemn decree of the Icelandic Al-Thing (solemn assembly of the people), became the national religion of Iceland. Thereupon King Olaf released the embargoed Icelandic vessels, Kjartan and all the Icelanders were permitted to return home, and, while Christianity became the settled religion of Norway and Iceland and her people, Olaf and his sainted successor had before them still years of struggle for the establishment of the true faith among the stubborn and heathen Norwegians and Icelanders.

St. Olaf, King of Norway, was even a more zealous apostle of the faith than King Olaf Tryggvason, and his methods for its propagation were the same as those of the latter. With a chosen band of three hundred picked soldiers, he traversed his kingdom, and overthrew the altars and idols of paganism, and wherever the milder persuasions of the zealous and eloquent missionaries, who also accompanied his crusades, did not prevail, the sword was sure to do so. The following account of this sainted monarch is taken from the pages of Dr. Alban Butler's "Lives of the Saints." "This religious king, having settled his dominions in peace, set himself to extirpate out of them the abominable superstitions of idolatry. He travelled in person from town to town, exhorting his subjects to open the eyes of their souls to the bright light of faith. A company of zealous preachers attended him, and he demolished in many places the idolatrous temples. The heathens rebelled, and, with the assistance of Canutus the Great, defeated and expelled him. Olaf fled to Russia, whence he soon after returned, and raised an army in order to recover his kingdom, but was slain by his rebellious and infidel subjects, in a battle fought at Stichstadt, north of Drontheim, on the twenty-ninth of July, 1030, having reigned sixteen years. St. Olaf's body was honorably buried in the Cathedral at Drontheim, and the year following Bishop Grimkele commanded him to be honored in that church among the saints with the title of martyr. His son, Magnus, was called home from Russia, in 1035, and restored to the throne. The body of St. Olaf was found incorrupt in 1098; and again when the Lutherans in 1541 plundered the shrine, which was adorned with gold and jewels of great value. The Lutherans treated the saint's body with great respect, and left it in the same place where the shrine had stood, in the inner wooden case, until, in 1568, they decently buried it in the same cathedral. His shrine became famous by many miracles, and he was honored with extraordinary devotion throughout all the northern kingdoms, and was titular saint of several churches in England and Scotland." And we might add that subsequently Christian churches were under his invocation in our western hemisphere.

PROFESSOR FISHER ON "UNSECTARIANISM" IN THE COMMON SCHOOLS.

IT is encouraging to find a writer appealing to logic, especially when so many, whether from fear or over-much reverence, keep at such a respectful distance from it. He may indeed badly disappoint us, but he emboldens us to note any departure from this acknowledged standard, to insist on logical cogency, and to ask for proof instead of assertion whenever he assumes the *rôle* of reasoner.

Accordingly, in an article which Prof. Fisher has contributed to the *Forum* for last April, criticising an article by Cardinal Manning in an earlier issue of the same periodical, we naturally enough look for the Professor's reason for attributing to the Cardinal "so many pages of misleading statement and of fallacious—it would not be wrong to say sophistical—reasoning as make up his recent article in the *Forum*." The reason assigned by the learned Professor is the simple evident fact that the Cardinal never lived in America. But how this can weigh with impartial judgment is not so evident, especially since the Cardinal is careful to tell us: "Being called on by an American to speak, I will not be silent. Nevertheless, I shall confine myself to the *ipsissima verba*, the very syllables, of American citizens, and of some of great public responsibility." Mr. Richard Grant White and Hon. Zach. Montgomery, whose words the Cardinal makes the "foundation" of his argument, did not labor under the disadvantage of non-residence in America.

How, again, a short residence in America would have taught Cardinal Manning that "statistics are good for nothing and prove nothing," is hard to see, nor does our logical Professor throw any light on the difficulty. Statistics are statistics the world over, for a reasoner in England as much as for a reasoner in America. Reasoning abstracts from the *hic et nunc* in its valid processes. Either the statistics must be denied, or the reasoner must not be blamed for using them. If they are valid premises whereon to build a sound argument in other cases, why not in the case of the public-school question, in the case of education? Statistics are reckoned good for *much* in debates of weightiest importance in Congress and out of Congress, in courts of judicature, in America, in the British Parliament, in Germany, everywhere. Is it only when applied to the school question that they are "good for nothing and prove nothing"? Is this a specimen of the logic that undertakes to support so vital a question as education before an enlightened, freedom-loving, and impartial American public?

But Prof. Fisher insists that by a very short residence in America the Cardinal "would be aware that the opinions adverse to our common-school system, which he quotes from Richard Grant White and the rest of his authorities, are utterly contrary to the judgment of the great body of Americans of high principle and robust intelligence whose ancestors were born on the soil."

Without inquiring where the ancestors of Mr. R. G. White or the "rest of his authorities" were born, whether on the soil or not, it might perhaps be easily maintained that the opinions of these gentlemen, though "utterly contrary to the judgment" of those so complacently styled "of high principle and robust intelligence," are just as reliable as, and a good deal more reasonable than, are those of their critic. It is a strange conceit that would attach "high principle and robust intelligence" to those whose ancestors happened to be "born on the soil," especially in a republic whose first claim to existence, as set forth in the Declaration of Independence, rests upon the "self-evident truth, that all men are created equal," and in a country, too, where, if traced little more than a century back, the best of those "born on the soil" were foreign subjects; and traced a little farther still, ancestry vanishes, and all are found to be incomers. Add to this the fact that the highest and most responsible office of trust in the gift of the American people is open to the worthy candidate who was himself "born on the soil," no matter what country gave birth to his parents. It is indeed the peculiar boast, the honest pride, and noble privilege of every American citizen that, independent and irrespective of ancestry, no matter who his parents or where they came from, if he himself is of "high principle and robust intelligence," he is made to feel 'tis "worth makes the man, and want of it the fellow." It did not detract from his merit nor hinder his promotion to the pinnacle of honor and trust, that General Sheridan came of parents who were born in Ireland. Nor did it detract from the acknowledged ability and tact and patriotism of another American citizen, that not even himself was "born on the soil," when Archbishop Hughes, of New York, in the darkest hour of the Civil War, cheerfully complied with the request of the Government to plead the cause of the Union before some of the powers of Europe, and to influence public opinion in favor of the north. Alluding to this, Secretary Seward wrote in 1864: "At a juncture of deep interest to the country, the Archbishop, associated with others, went abroad and did the nation a service there, with all the loyalty, fidelity, and practical wisdom which, on so many other occasions, illustrated his great ability for administration."

In the name of logic, to which the learned Professor appeals, we ask, what has Cardinal Manning's antecedents to do with the

validity of his reasoning in the *Forum?* What has Ultra- or Citramontanism to do with the argument? What weak point in his article will the candid critic detect from the fact that even before the infallible decision of the Vatican Council he held the doctrine propounded by that decision and immediately subscribed to by the small minority? Did it show lack of judgment, of intelligence, or of fearless freedom, to have defended vigorously a position which even his opponents declared was right, while theirs was wrong? Everybody must see the force of this irrelevancy as going far to prove a weakness either in the cause or in its defender, or in both, and a corresponding robustness in the argumentative array it leaves unscathed. It certainly has not the effect of lowering in public estimation one whom even Gladstone's versatile genius, with all the energy put forth in his "Expostulation," could only serve to render more conspicuous for "high principle and robust intelligence" in having so strenuously advocated truths and rights that so signally triumphed over the "anger and alarm of the civil authority in Catholic as well as in Protestant lands."

But this long detail of irrelevant matter, embracing what we are told the Cardinal said and did and thought in the past, if it has no possible bearing upon the logical issue, is made, however, to do good service as a sort of preamble to the Professor's easy assumption: "Of course, the Cardinal can look on the American system of government—on the idea of a free Church in a free State—with no other feeling than intense disapprobation."

Who told him, how knows he, what the Cardinal can or cannot look on without disapprobation? What he did disapprove of he had the courage, when asked, frankly to declare; but more than that, he gave his reasons. It became the Professor to meet these reasons squarely, instead of diverting attention into another channel. Or does he mean to tell us that one cannot be dissatisfied with the public-school system as now conducted, without being at the same time dissatisfied with the "American system of government"? Is there no difference, in his mind, between an essential constituent and an excrescence? We may not, then, wonder at his seeming unconsciousness of the contradiction when he calls the Cardinal an Ultramontanist. For an Ultramontanist is one with the Pope, having the same sentiments with him. But the Pope has expressed himself again and again as perfectly pleased with the relations subsisting between Catholics in America and their government, with our "free Church in a free State." And the late action of the several rulers in almost the whole world, during the celebration of the Papal Jubilee, demonstrates most forcibly that the Pope is universally regarded as inimical to no form of government on earth. Our late President did not think he was offending Leo XIII. by

giving him a copy of our Constitution, nor did any word or act of the distinguished recipient denote dissatisfaction. The Cardinal, "one of the foremost champions of the Ultramontanist school," must of course have been equally pleased with so appropriate an offering. But there was no blot there to disfigure the fair face of that noble document. No public-school system flourished there. Whoever adheres most closely to the letter and spirit of the Constitution, is certainly most friendly to the best interests of America. Not the Cardinal, then, but the advocate of the public schools is running counter to the true spirit of the Republic. The school system he disapproves of here he disapproves of at home in England. And yet he claims to be as loyal to the throne as Mr. Richard Grant White and Mr. Montgomery are to the Republic. And all three may claim as much devotedness to their respective forms of polity as can the advocates of the objectionable school systems on either side of the water, Prof. Fisher not excepted.

In the *Contemporary Review* (November, 1888), Canon Gregory, representing the Church of England, makes this comment (p. 645): "The Education Act of 1870 practically establishes a new religion, 'Undenominationalism,' for the elementary schools of the country, which has the singular merit of being a religion which nobody who cares for religion (whatever his faith or denomination may be) would teach his own children, but which for political reasons seems to be regarded as sufficiently good for the poorer classes."

Again, on p. 657, he says: "The majority demand religious liberty for believers as well as for unbelievers, for those who have a definite faith as much as for those who have none. At present—in England—the whole school-board rate is given to schools where no religious teaching is given, or where the religion taught is so nebulous that it does not admit of being expressed in a creed, or so indefinite that it cannot be formulated into the accurate terms of a catechism. This is enforced by Act of Parliament, and is not left to the free determination of the various bodies by whom school-rates are levied, and is, in my opinion, a gross violation of the principle of religious liberty."

Canon Gregory then quotes from the majority report of the Education Commission to show that all the evidence gathered by their prolonged investigation "is practically unanimous as to the desire of the parents for the religious and moral training of their children."

Rev. Thomas McMillan, C.S.P., in the *Catholic World* for April, commenting on the above words of Canon Gregory, says: "Our American school-boards make little or no provision for the wishes of parents. Let us hope that the parental voice will soon make itself heard in discussions of the educational question."

The members of the Royal Education Commission represented many denominations, and in their majority report agreed upon the following declaration, quoted by Canon Gregory:

"Whilst differing widely in our views concerning religious truth, we are persuaded that the only safe foundation on which to construct a theory of morals, or to secure high moral conduct, is the religion which our Lord Jesus Christ has taught the world. As we look to the Bible for instruction concerning morals, and take its words for the declaration of what is morality, so we look to the same inspired source for the sanctions by which men may be led to practise what is there taught, and for instruction concerning the help by which they may be enabled to do what they have learned to be right."

"What," continues Father McMillan, "has unsectarianism to offer as a substitute for this plain statement, which ought to be acceptable to all Christians? The genuine unsectarian code must be detached from every positive religious belief. Perhaps it is to be formed—for it does not yet exist—of the moral axioms, ancient and modern According to one of the writers in the *Christian Register*, 'Axiomatic morality is moral moonshine.'"

So it is not Ultramontanists alone that object to the public-school system (it is one with the English system in the objectionable feature of excluding religion), nor are externs the only ones who think that the parental voice ought to be heard and parental rights respected. Far back in the centuries an English archbishop (Langton) could raise his voice in behalf of the liberties of his countrymen, and the Magna Charta was achieved. And one of the foremost advocates of freedom to-day, one of the fastest friends of the people, one of the most outspoken and fearless defenders of the rights of man as man, is confessedly Cardinal Manning.

It is only necessary to take Prof. Fisher's statements at random, *e medio acervo*, to find them abounding in contradictions. He boasts that "English and American liberty was gained by depriving government of many of its old prerogatives"; and almost in the same breath he blames those who are endeavoring to hinder governments from resuming these prerogatives or assuming similar ones. If resistance to unjust taxation, even by force, was, according to the Professor, eminently praisworthy, how can a calm reasoning on the subject of another unjust taxation be condemnable? Or is it not unjust to tax people for the purchase of a commodity they cannot and will not consume? Is not the "plea for human rights, the rights of the individual and of the family," something more than "specious," even if they do "cut off the State from the office of providing the means of unsectarian education for the body of its citizens"? If the body of its citizens pro-

fess not "unsectarianism," how is it not unjust to have it imposed upon them? Why favor the few at the expense of the many? If the State cannot patronize any one form of religion, why patronize "unsectarianism," which means irreligion? According to Washington, who certainly is a good authority on the rights and duties of Americans, morality cannot be maintained without religion. "Unsectarianism" is, then, incapable of inculcating morality. But morality in the citizens is essential to the very existence of a republic. How, then, is he not the best friend to the Republic who endeavors to secure that which alone secures the stability of the Republic, viz., religion?

The Cardinal's statement, "The law of nature has invested parents with these responsibilities" (of teaching and training their children), "parents have the right to control the education of their children," the Professor does not attempt to deny; and for good reasons, for its truth cannot be denied. What, then, does he do? He sets right against right; and, of course, the right of the weaker must yield. The State is stronger; its right must therefore prevail over the rights of parents and children. Not so thought the framers of our Constitution and of the Declaration of Independence. Among the truths held to be self-evident is the endowment of all men by their Creator with the inalienable right "of pursuing happiness." But happiness here is but a stepping-stone to happiness hereafter. How, then, can the State interfere with this inalienable right by shutting out from the child's view this future happiness, and hindering the parents from securing it to their offspring? This the State does by shutting out religion from the school.

The Professor puts himself, in this contention, on the side of the British Government at the time of the Declaration of Independence, whereas the Cardinal's argument ranks his with those immortal names "that were not born to die." "The State," says Professor Fisher, "has a right to guard its own existence, and to provide for what is essential to its well-being." But that was just the argument of that bigger State, the British Government: Taxation of the Colonies is essential to my well-being, and I must have the taxes. The Colonies replied: They infringe on our natural rights, our inalienable rights, and you cannot have them. So the Professor says for the State: Taxation for "unsectarianism" is essential to our existence and well-being, and we must have these taxes. The Cardinal speaks for parents and children: Taxes for "unsectarianism" infringe upon our natural and inalienable rights, and you are not going to have them. Burke and Chatham, and other friends of the British Government, told them they were deceived by false reasoners; that unjust taxation of the Colonies was not essential to the existence

or the well-being of the mother country, but fraught with danger to both. So, too, speak all true friends of our country to-day: No unjust taxation for "unsectarianism" can be essential to the existence and well-being of the Republic, but must jeopardize both. And in this they but re-echo the words of Washington, reduced to their logical conclusion. For he said: No morality, no State; no religion, no morality; and all say: "Unsectarianism," no religion.

But the Professor says: "The State, as really as the family, is a divine institution." Yes, it is. *Non est potestas nisi a Deo.* But the family was before the State; and the State was instituted, not for the injury of families, but for their good. But the good of families consists in having their natural and inalienable rights respected, not in their destruction. Therefore, the natural rights of families and individuals must determine the limits of civil power, of the rights of the State. Pointing to these limits as the boundary between the two rights, the heads of families and the members composing them can rightly say to the State: "Thus far, and no further." Here the natural law, echo of the eternal law, has securely entrenched us in its inviolable sanctuaries, our homes. Let the learned Professor know that the State is for the people, not the people for the State; that the good of the people is the end of the State, happiness the end of the people; that the happiness of man consists in his perfection as man, and perfection in the possession and enjoyment of the good that perfects him as a rational being. Shut out the *Summum Bonum*, the Infinite Good, from his view, from his hope, from his fruition, and man is bereft of happiness now and always. But this is done by "unsectarianism." Who, then, takes the more reasonable and philanthropic view of the public-school question, the Cardinal or the Professor? Let logic, reason, common sense decide. Nobody denies that families and parents have duties to the State. For rights and duties are correlative, and one connotes the other when the relations between man and man are in question; and he only can justly claim his rights from others who faithfully renders his duties to them.

Another of the Professor's arguments: "The second thing to be said is, that what the Cardinal and his adherents are really contending for is not the rights of the family and of the parent, but the moral right of the clergy to prescribe to the parent and the family how much and what sort of instruction the children shall receive." The Professor is again mistaken. There is no need of contending for a right conceded. But the moral right of the clergy to "prescribe to the parent and the family how much and what sort of instruction the children shall receive" in what appertains to faith and morals, is conceded wherever Christianity, as handed down

from the Apostles, is admitted—wherever the Catholic Church extends. This right is involved in the very name Apostles. They were sent by One having "all power in heaven and in earth" (St. Matth. xxviii., 18). In receiving their mission, the Apostles received their right. What right? Hear the Divine Founder of Christianity: "Go teach all nations" (Americans were not excluded) . . . . "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you" (St. Matth., xxviii., 19). The Apostles then had the right to "prescribe to the parent and the family how much and what sort of instruction the children shall receive" in regard to the Christian religion, in regard to faith and morals, what to believe, and how to regulate their actions. This right had to be admitted, or the Christian religion could not be accepted. It is part and parcel of Christianity. Without it we could neither have Scripture nor Tradition. Deny this right to the Apostles, and Christianity is not Christianity; no divine institution, but a huge imposture, the outcome of outrageous usurpation. But the lawful successors of the Apostles were and are invested with the same rights as the Apostles. Therefore, the bishops and priests in the Church of Christ to-day, the clergy in the Catholic Church, the *Ecclesia Docens*, have the acknowledged right to teach both parent and family "to observe all things whatsoever" Jesus Christ commanded the Apostles. Not only have they the right, but the duty is incumbent on them to teach the doctrine of Christ. "Go, teach," are the terms of a positive command. The Divine command must be obeyed. It is the source, and origin, and foundation of all duties. Now, there is this difference between a right and a duty. The right may sometimes be foregone; the claiming of it is not obligatory. A duty can never be omitted; its performance is always obligatory. Hence, the Apostles Peter and John, when threatened by the Jews and charged "not to speak at all, nor teach in the name of Jesus," answered: "If it be just in the sight of God to hear you rather than God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard" (Acts iv., 19 and 20). And St. Paul says: "A necessity lieth upon me: for woe is unto me if I preach not the Gospel" (Cor. i., ix., 16). Therefore, it is for "the rights of the family and of the parent" alone that the Cardinal is contending. The other right is conceded. And this right leaves parents perfectly free to teach their children what and how they please, only guarding with great care the precious deposit of the faith once delivered to the Apostles, reminding all that "the just man liveth by faith," and "without faith it is impossible to please God" (Heb. xi., 6).

The objection to taxing citizens for the education of children not their own is very nicely disposed of by our logical Professor

in this wise: Citizens are taxed for making roads they may never travel, for building light-houses they may never use; why not then contribute toward the education of their neighbors' children, even though they be richer than the taxed themselves? "As if," he writes, "the vital interests of the entire community are not likewise the interests of the individual, which he is bound, as a member of the community, to foster and protect by contributing his proper share to the cost of securing them."

How can "unsectarianism," we ask, be of any, not to say vital, interest, since, according to Washington, it ruins the community? For "unsectarianism" leaves out religion, therefore morality, therefore the security of the community. Or is it because supported by taxation that it becomes of vital interest? Then, was the notorious "tax upon tea" of vital interest to the Colonies. But a century has proved that they can live without it. At this rate of reasoning it is enough to say of any system of oppression: It is supported by taxation, and must therefore be among the "vital interests of the community."

But Prof. Fisher says "there is no tax which Americans, as a rule, north or south, east or west, pay with more readiness than the school-tax." *O immensa simplicitas!* Mr. Professor, how many denominational schools have these same taxpayers built? How many children frequent them? Count them, and then say if they gladly pay taxes to build schools they never use, to pay teachers they will not have? Do not say that the only opposition to the public schools comes from the clergy, that we may not expose the "flimsy character of this logic." The clergy explain to the people what is sound in faith and right in morals. Therefore, they are the only people in favor of wholesome food at table in families, the only enemies to poisonous admixtures. The people freely accept the clergy, as they do the Christian religion. If they voluntarily take them for their guides in matters of faith and morals, their acts are still their own quite as much as if they were led by "unsectarianism."

Another flourish: "To one who was born and bred in New England, or has had the opportunity to see the working of our school system in other parts of the land, it seems strange to be called upon to defend it. It is like undertaking to prove that the sunshine is beneficial, and that the invigorating breezes that blow over our hills and plains are of use to the human beings who dwell upon them."

What a wonderfully strong argument this against the Cardinal, who quotes from Americans themselves. Has neither Mr. White nor Mr. Montgomery "had the opportunity to see the working of our school system"? It appears they have seen too much of it.

"The confounding of consequent with effect—the *propter hoc* with the *post hoc*," which the Professor claims to detect in the Cardinal's argument, is a prominent feature in his own reply. The nation has been making wonderful progress coexistently with the public schools; therefore, it was owing to them that it did so. As well say: The sun has mounted high in the heavens while covered with clouds; therefore, the clouds have brought it to its zenith.

The Professor does not want to argue from effects to causes. He denies the validity of statistics. He does not want to examine the system *a priori* on its own intrinsic merits. What, then, does he do? He calls on General F. A. Walker to help him bolster up a limping cause. Here is how the General reasons: He is comparing Massachusetts with "another State." "So far, then," these are his words, "the paucity of the prison lists of the latter State simply represents the toleration of vice, if not of crime." That is, Massachusetts has a larger prison list; therefore, it is in that proportion more free from crime, a more moral State. This is using statistics with a vengeance. To make the people moral, he makes the laws tyrannical or ridiculous. If they are moral, why imprison them? If they are imprisoned, how are they moral? Either, then, the rulers or the ruled are not what they ought to be. This defence is worse than none for the public-school system. Where is logic gone all this time?

Professor Fisher says: "It is true that the strongest incentives to the practice of morality are the motives presented in the religion of the Gospel." Why not, then, give our youth the strongest incentives to the practice of morality, by substituting denominational schools, where the religion of the Gospel can be taught, for your public schools as at present conducted? Are you afraid that our youth will grow up too moral? Is virtue so easy to be acquired and practised that the smallest inducement will suffice, if, indeed, any is wanted?

Regarding text-books, the Professor says: "Mr. Gladstone, in his plan for universities in Ireland, proposed to exclude from the course of study philosophy and history. A university without these two studies would be like a man without eyes." But why did Mr. Gladstone propose to leave them out? Was he so blind as not to see that a blind university was not what it ought to be? No. But that very shrewd man saw that he had of two evils to choose the lesser. He could not have either of these branches in a school intended for Catholics and Protestants. It would be like trying to harmonize day and night. But what Mr. Gladstone esteems worse than blindness, Prof. Fisher thinks is good enough for our American schools. To be sure, in a university, where the comparatively matured judgment of students may be presumably taken as toler-

ably competent to make due discrimination in reading history, a one-sided view is extremely dangerous; but in the elementary public schools, and even high schools, there is not the least danger of distorting facts. And as to philosophy in these latter schools, its influence, first on the teacher's mind, and then through him on the minds of his pupils, must count for naught; and it matters not whether it be transcendental, agnostic, pantheistic, or positivist, provided it be not formally taught, "save possibly in the rudiments," and that only "in the high school."

Blindness will not do for a school, says the learned Professor. Better that than worse, said Mr. Gladstone. So, whichever way you fix it, it is either blindness or worse than blindness, in regard to two important studies in the undenominational or "unsectarian" system. We say, we want neither blindness nor worse than blindness. Give each denomination its own schools, and be just to all.

The closing argument of the Professor, his clincher, is an appeal to politicians. "The only hope of the adversary," he writes, "must lie in the desire of politicians to catch votes; and these will soon learn, if they do not know by instinct, that in taking wrong ground on this vital question they will lose vastly more votes than they can hope to win."

The learned Professor forgets what he had stated a few pages back, "that there is no tax which Americans, as a rule, north or south, east or west, pay with more readiness than the school-tax." Again: "To one who . . . . has the opportunity to see the working of our school system in other parts of the land, it seems strange to be called upon to defend it. It is like undertaking to prove that the sunshine is beneficial, and that the invigorating breezes that blow over our hills and plains are of use to the human beings who dwell upon them."

If the people throughout the length and breadth of the land are most ready to pay the school-tax, if they see that the public schools are beneficial as the sunshine, useful as the invigorating breezes, what necessity to threaten politicians with loss of votes if they do not commit themselves to the defense of the system? Why not leave them free in a free republic to act conscientiously and according to their convictions for the public good, for the general welfare, for the best interests of the whole community? Not so does the Cardinal, not so do we do. We appeal to the right reason, the good sense, the highest interests of the people themselves, of the heads and the members of families, to claim their "natural and inalienable right to pursue happiness." The full measure of happiness, the highest and greatest attainable in this life, consists in virtue as taught by Christianity; and a virtuous life opens the

door to infinite and eternal happiness. But this virtue cannot subsist without the succors of religion (the Christian religion). Religious training cannot, therefore, be excluded from our schools without shutting out youth first, and manhood afterward, and at the same time the parents of the youth, from their "inalienable right to the pursuit of happiness."

THE ANGLICAN BISHOP OF LINCOLN.

THE "trial" of the Bishop of Lincoln, as it has been somewhat erroneously styled, has not excited that degree of public interest which so great an event seemed to promise. Had such a trial taken place fifty years ago—just on the eve of the birth of the new Puseyism—it would have set all thinking Englishmen "by the ears." In these days we are too accustomed to the battles of the Ritualists with their bishops, their parishioners, and the Privy Council to feel much surprise because one more turn of the wheel of fortune has put a bishop into the position of defendant. It is thought to be rather curious than scandalizing. Besides, we have grown familiar with the pictures in the shop windows of the Bishop of Lincoln in full pontificals; so that the "trial" is but a step in the progress of an enthusiast towards what he considers to be perfection. Events have been leading up to it for many years. Sooner or later a bishop would be prosecuted. Yet it is curious that no provision against this accident was thought of by Parliament or by Convocation. A bishop can veto an action against a rector; but an archbishop cannot veto an action against a bishop. This was an oversight. A clause in the Act of Parliament would have enabled His Grace of Canterbury to save himself all this trouble and responsibility.

To judge of the "absurdity" of this trial—using the word "absurd" in the Euclid sense—let us put back the date of it fifty years. Say that we are in the year 1839, and let us see how a trial of a Bishop of Lincoln for adopting certain "Roman Catholic" rites and ceremonies would have appeared to the guileless Protestants of that time. The imagination will sometimes help us to see the absurdity of a position more quickly and more securely than will dry reason. We will go back then to the year 1839; and we will

bear in mind that it is the *same* Church which is now prosecuting the Bishop of Lincoln for being, familiarly speaking, "a Roman Catholic," which in 1839 looked on Roman Catholicity as an impossibility from an Anglican or, indeed, from an English point of view.

The present writer may be pardoned if he speaks from his own recollections of what the Church of England was in 1839. By the Church of England he means that idea and that fact which were present to the minds of the Protestant nation. That idea and that fact were a national institution, most admirably adapted to British needs. The Church of England was respectable, it was comfortable. It did not oblige us to do anything that was penitential, nor to believe in anything that annoyed our private judgment. [The present writer is speaking of his Protestant days.] It proposed to us the beautiful sentiment of Christianity, but did not harass us with definitions of doctrine. The creeds were the literary ballast of the institution, but the real religion of Anglicanism was its sentiment; and a very beautiful sentiment it was. No one who knew the English mind of fifty years ago could deny that the beautiful sentiment of Christianity was firmly planted in the deepest heart of the whole nation, and that the very wrath of the popular mind against "Romanism" was based on the assumption that it "lowered Christ." Fantastic, or even imbecile, as such an assumption might be, there it was in the minds of the huge majority; and the assumption made the National Church Protestant. At the present day it is almost impossible for a young Catholic to understand what the force was in 1839 of the word Protestant. It meant a deep fear, a deep loathing, of Popery. Though a negative, it was a positive, frame of mind. To protest was the doctrinal armory of the faithful Christian. Without protest there could, of course, be no Protestantism; and was not Protestantism the pure religion of the Bible? Hence, Protestantism necessarily involved "no sacerdotalism." The clergy were not called priests, they were called ministers. The laity were not obedient, they were respectful. The public worship was not "Mass," it was "service." The altar—there was no such thing; there was a communion table. The whole idea was that of a religion that was divine, protected by a church that was human. And the protector-church did its duty unflinchingly. Its postulate was "No Popery"; and all its teaching, its preaching, even its praying, were grounded on that supreme national negative. With perfect consistency the Church of England stripped her communion tables of every ornament save the clergymen's large prayer-books. With perfect consistency she put her big pulpits and big prayer-desks right in front of her meagre-looking communion tables, to show

that preaching was more important than "taking the sacrament"; she hid her fonts away in corners or even in vestries, lest the simple folk should think too much of baptism; she made her clergy to preach in black gowns, not in white ones, lest their garb should even hint at sacerdotalism; she put a lay clerk into a little box under the reading desk, whose duty it was to make the responses for the congregation, so that she might teach the laity that they came to church to hear sermons and not, primarily, to take part in the form of prayer; she filled her churches with hideous pews—not open seats—well furnished with comfortable cushions, comfortable hassocks, and closed in with bolted doors, not even latched doors—for strict privacy and a sort of assured domestic peace; and she left the poor only to sit where they could find room, on open benches without cushions, without hassocks, so that they might practise publicly the beautiful virtue of humility while the clergyman was preaching it from the pulpit.

Now we have supposed, we are supposing, that in those days of the Church of England, about the year 1839, and in the Victorian era, a Bishop of Lincoln had been prosecuted for that almost only Protestant heresy, the imitating of the forms and ceremonies of the Church of Rome. Well, this is to imagine what is absolutely unimaginable. Such a thing could not possibly have been. No bishop was in those days even a Puseyite, and as to Ritualism, it had never been heard of. Ceremonial was a practice attributed to foreign Papists. The "Reformation" had wiped it out from Protestant England. To hate ceremonies, to hate forms, symbols, suggestiveness, was a corollary of the proved iniquity of being "Romanizing." As to a cross, had a clergyman put one into his church—but no, he would as soon have thought of putting a crucifix. As to "genuflecting at the altar"— in the first place, there was no altar, and, in the next place, there was not anything to which to genuflect. Had a clergyman in those days "genuflected to the elements"; had he presumed to turn his back upon the people; had he lit a candle on the communion table, or even placed there a candle that was not lit; had he worn any vestment save a surplice, varied only by his university or preaching gown; had he done anything, in short, which Anglican clergymen do now, he would have been regarded as "not responsible for his actions." The "appeal" would not have been to a trial, it would have been to a doctor learned in lunacy. No such clerical eccentricity was ever imagined; still less was it ever experimented or perpetrated. And so, too, as to preaching: a sermon on the Real Presence, on confession, or even on fasting,—save only to "protest" against such Popery,—would have been regarded as an indication that the preacher was of unsound mind, and perhaps his wife would

have been kindly spoken to on the subject. Even if a preacher went so far as to hint that baptism might possibly be accompanied by regeneration, he was thought to be treading on delicate ground, and the next Sunday he might find it prudent to compromise. A young curate, in the year 1840, did go so far as to say in a sermon that "the Roman Catholic Church was to be commended for insisting on the importance of doctrine; and it would be well if, in the Church of England, there were more insistance on it"; a sentence which he was requested to qualify on the following Sunday, as it seemed to imply that the Roman Church *could* teach doctrine. Exactly as the ceremonial was forbidden, so was the definite doctrine ignored, save only on the broad truths of Redemption, to deny which would have been to deny Christianity. The positive side of the teaching was wholly limited to those broad truths, but the negative side,—much the stronger side of the two,—was inclusive of the passionate denial of all that approximated to "Romanism," of all such views as implied a Christian priesthood, an altar, a consecration, a sacrifice, or of whatever assumed authority to be connected with ministry, or powers to be connected with ordination.

This Anglican Church, then, of the year 1839, was either the same Church as is that of 1889, or else is was another and a contrary Church. If it was the same Church, then it is obvious that the Bishop of Lincoln may well plead the absurdity of prosecuting him, since *most* of the Anglican clergymen of the present day present a doctrine as well as a ritual to their flocks which are much more distinct from those presented fifty years ago than are *his* doctrine and ritual from *theirs*. But if the Church of 1839 was a different and a contrary Church—bearing only the same relations to the State—then is the prosecution equally absurd; because the Church of England of to-day cannot possibly be that Church of England which was manufactured by Queen Elizabeth out of thin air, if it had no corporate existence in 1839; any more than it can be the same Church which Pope Gregory paternally governed a thousand years before Queen Elizabeth died. The Bishop of Lincoln might well ask the Archbishop of Canterbury,—before whose judgment seat he was originally summoned,—"Which Church does your Grace happily preside over? Is it the Church of Pope Gregory or of Queen Elizabeth; the Church of 1839 or of 1889; the Church of no altar, no priesthood, no ritual, or the Church which to-day insists on all three? Your Grace is more to be pitied than I am; for, whereas I have only to answer for myself, and can only represent my own theology, Your Grace has to answer for at least three Churches, each and all of which you are supposed to represent."

But the Bishop of Lincoln has not taken this playful line. It would be difficult to state his line with perfect fairness. Indeed, he has necessarily taken two lines—his legal line as a defendant in an action, and his personal line as a champion of "Catholic truth." As a defendant, he has had the advantage of a first-rate counsel, the learned and the High Church Sir Walter Phillimore. But let us speak first of his personal line, and see if we can make it out as a would-be logical combination of two opposites. He has written letters during his trial to many who condoled with him; and almost everybody has condoled with him from personal regard. He has written to one friend: "It is gratifying to me that the workingmen of England are beginning to understand what the Church of England is." If they do understand this, they must be wiser than their betters, wiser than the Archbishop of Canterbury or Sir Walter Phillimore, wiser than the Church Association (which was the prosecutor), and wiser than the English Church Union, which cannot succeed in uniting Anglicans in one belief. Further, the Bishop has written: "The workingmen of England see that, in the Church of England, God has given them their inheritance in the Catholic Church." This is puzzling. Does it mean that the Church of England is the Catholic Church? If so, the first note of Catholicity must be tumultuousness in the discordancy of its sects. Or does it mean that Catholicity includes Anglicanism? If so, what can it possibly exclude? For even the two Anglican Communions of 1839, 1889, can boast of nothing in common but State dependance. But, again, the Bishop writes: "In the Church of England we find that rest to head and heart which no rank or wealth can command, and with which no earthly blessing can compare." "Rest to head and heart!" And this, too, at the very moment when the Bishop is taking his trial for trying to imitate Catholic worship, and trying to teach some Catholic doctrines. Finally, the Bishop piously hopes that the result of his trial may be that the English people "will know more and more the blessings which God has provided for them in the English Church." If they do not know those "blessings" already, they must be slow of apprehension and acquirement. Now, everybody has been made aware that Dr. King, Bishop of Lincoln, is a most superior and most amiable gentleman. We may therefore say, respectfully, that we wish he were well out of the muddle which his anomalous Anglican position imposes on him. He is too good for the rôle he has chosen to play. He has no more right to be in the Church of England than in Methodism. His sympathies are with everything which the Church of England has always repudiated, and opposed to everything which the Church of England has always approved. True, there have always been a few Anglican divines who have ad-

vocated what are called High Church doctrines; but there have been none who have worn chasubles, none who have "said Mass," none who have publicly carried the episcopal crozier—or have had it carried before them by a chaplain—none who have posed as "real, live Catholic bishops," to quote the jaunty expression of a daily paper. High Churchism was only an abstract ideal, a hypothesis, a theory to be argued in Anglican quarterlies, up to the time when the "Tracts for the Times" were begun. Dr. King is the first Anglican bishop who has made the *mis-en-scène* of Catholic worship to be didactic of Catholic doctrine in Protestant churches. He has "turned Papist without becoming one," as a writer put it in a letter to the London *Chronicle*. He might as well address His Grace of Canterbury as "Your Holiness" as play at being a Catholic bishop in Protestant churches.

As a defendant in a legal quarrel forced upon him, he has taken perhaps a more tenable position. Yet no human being can sincerely care two straws whether an Anglican bishop should be tried, in the first instance, before the Archbishop of Canterbury with his assessors, or before the bishops of the Province of Canterbury, assembled under the Queen's writ in Convocation. Such a bone of contention could only be "matter for delay." In the Established Church the final appeal in spiritual causes always was and always will be the temporal courts; the Privy Council being, so to speak, the Anglican Holy See with which rests the ultimate decision. And every one knows—every one knew at the beginning—that each and all the practices for which the bishop was arraigned had already been condemned by this tribunal, had been declared unlawful by the Supreme Head of the Establishment, speaking through her council in Whitehall. The particular stages, therefore, by which the Privy Council might be reached were more interesting to lawyers than to clergymen. But what said Sir Walter Phillimore in his learned pleading? He proved by numerous instances that, in the old pre-"Reformation" times, bishops were not removed by temporal courts, but by the Pope, to whom they had promised obedience. Speaking of an episcopal trial in the sixteenth century, after the "Reformation" had begun its work, Sir Walter said: "The High Commission had, or assumed to have, just exactly the same powers which it claimed the king had, and it claimed that the king had all the powers that the Pope had. Therefore the fact of the High Commission assuming to deprive bishops does not in the least point to the fact that the Archbishop had the power; it only points to the fact that the Pope had the power." And what was true of the King's commission in the sixteenth century, is true of the Queen's council in the nineteenth century. Henry VIII., by special statute, granted an appeal to himself, or

to persons whom he should appoint to represent himself, "for lack of justice in any of the courts of the Archbishops in this realm"; and no one has denied that the same principle is still in force, and must govern the case of the Bishop of Lincoln. The Ritualists may wish that it were otherwise. Neither the queen nor her Parliament will oblige them.

Yet it is difficult to help a smile at the fact that Sir Walter Phillimore has striven throughout the whole of his learned pleading to unite the present Church of England with the pre-"Reformation" Church, as though the two Churches were one and the same Church. We can only rejoice that the learned counsel has fully proved that the Church of England, up to the time of the royal "Reformer," Henry VIII., always recognized the deposing power of the Pope, whereas, since then, she has always conformed to the civil power. Quoting the cases of several bishops who had been deposed, subsequent to the time of the Norman conquest, but previous to the time of the "Reformation," Sir Walter Phillimore affirmed that in each instance they had been "deposed by Papal Legate duly commissioned, and not by the English Metropolitan." Now it happens that Sir Walter Phillimore is himself a prominent member of what is called the English Church Union; so that one does not see how that Union can assert that there has always existed a separate Anglican communion or "Church of England" apart from the communion of the Pope; since no English bishop up to the time of the Reformation was ever out of communion with the Holy See. If the two Churches now called Roman and Anglican were (admittedly) the same Church before the "Reformation," but are (admittedly) two Churches now, how is it to be contended that the present Archbishop of Canterbury is Metropolitan of the same Church as were his predecessors? Sir Walter Phillimore was obliged to argue on the hypothesis that the two Churches *used* to be one and the same Church; yet he satisfactorily proved the "absurdity" of the position which he was forced to take up for argument's sake.

And now let us turn to the popular estimate in England of the real importance, the real gravity of the trial. Let us ask: What do "the public" think on the three points which are being principally discussed—the bishop's offence, the courts that try him, and the likely issue? There are, of course, different "schools" of British critics. We will classify them briefly, but sufficiently. And first, we will take the pretentiously superior school, represented by the *Saturday Review*. "The conduct of the Church Association (which prosecuted the Bishop of Lincoln) is," says the *Saturday Review*, "regarded with unqualified reprobation and disgust by every man in these kingdoms who combines honesty, intelligence, and loyalty

to the Anglican Church." Well, that is straightforward. But now as to the real value of the appeal in so far as it can issue in good or evil. "There is a large body—with whom we agree on the whole—who think that the hitherto decisions on subjects and cases kindred to this have been for the most part deplorably wrong in fact, in law, and in logic." This does not say much for the value of an appeal, even assuming that it should be carried on to a final judgment. But are the Ritualists right or wrong in their present attitude? The *Saturday Review* is quite unable to tell us. It can only say that *some* Ritualists seem to "aim at the transformation of the Church of England from the greatest example of a true Church, at once Catholic and National, that the world has ever seen, into a narrow dissenting sect—a little more Catholic perhaps in doctrine, but in all other respects not less narrow or sectarian than Baptists or anti-burghers." It would take a week to analyze such a sentence; so we will leave it as an example of "superior" Anglicanism.

The *Spectator* and other organs "beat round about the bush" in a similarly unsatisfactory sort of way. But the most interesting—and, we may also say, the most amusing—part of the controversy is the variety of suggestions which are offered for a *new* Court of Appeal, with the variety of answers which are made to them. Lord Carnarvon heads the list of correspondents who ridicule the idea of any new Court—which Lord Carnarvon calls "the phantom of a new Spiritual Court"—as "fitted rather for Utopia than for modern England," and as only leading us away from the real point at issue, "the vital question, how we can bar the way to religious persecution, and maintain that *comprehension* which is essential to the very existence of the Church of England." This seems common sense. "Comprehension" is the Church of England; or, rather, the Church of England is comprehension. If we were asked to define the Church of England in one word, and yet to do it so scientifically as to defy correction, we should simply write down "Comprehension."

The Dean of Windsor comes next in the list of correspondents who are commanding attention for the breadth of their suggestions. He does not like the Ritualists. They are "thwarting the efforts of the great central body, both lay and clerical, of the Church, for moral, social and religious improvement." This seems severe. We should take a much more favorable view of the Ritualists. They have done more to introduce earnestness into the Church of England, in the way both of parochial work and church attendance, than all the other Anglican sects put together.

But what say the High Church "religious" newspapers, for example, the *Church Review*, the *Church Times?* Let us try to

be perfectly fair in representing them. Says the *Church Review*: "Our contention is that God has, through Christ, given to the Apostles and their successors, the bishops and priests of the Church, the duty of ruling His kingdom on earth, and that we may not, from any motive whatever, give that duty to any other body in the world. . . . . Let us have no more litigation until the Church's courts have been re-erected, and a Court of Appeal has been found to satisfy Church and State, and all may yet be well." As this supposes a solution which will never be realized—which, in the very nature of things cannot be realized—and which, if it were realized, would leave out of the question the fact that the Church of England, for three centuries, has been devoid of any spiritual Court of Appeal, we cannot commend it as either practical or sincere. But, on the other hand, we can most cordially agree with the *Church Review* that anything more fantastically inconsistent or "absurd"—as Euclid would have truthfully expressed it—than to prosecute a bishop for mediævalism, while leaving hundreds of clergymen to deny Christian verities with equal audacity and impunity, has not been known, even in the inconsistent Church of England.

We need not stay to quote the *Church Times*, which writes in a similar vein to that of the *Church Review*, but we will next quote a newspaper which represents the Low Church party, or rather the lowest possible section of that party. Says the *Rock*:

"The trial of the Bishop of Lincoln is doing good, in that it is forcing the Ritualists to show their hand, and is opening the eyes of Englishmen to the real character of the Ritualist conspiracy. Doubtless there are High Churchmen and Advanced Churchmen who would hail a Church Court of their own creation, and would abide by its decisions. But the majority of their party will agree to nothing short of a surrender to them all along the line. Even then they would be restless; for they have so long been a law to themselves they would never bow to rule or ruler, save to their own sweet will. In their very ritual each church or section of churches has its peculiar ritual, and some in their vestments and services are Roman, some are Anglican of a mediæval type. Place them in ascendency, and they will begin to tear each other's throats as vigorously as they have hitherto been rending the Church of England. Wilfulness and disloyalty are a passion, and speedily become a habit."

This passage may be quoted as showing the "unity" of the Church of England; though beyond its value in that one groove of demonstration, we should be sorry to look upon it as "Anglican." We may rather prefer the sarcastic vein of the Dean of Windsor, who has said to the whole body of the Ritualists, "Name any tribunal you *would* accept." This challenge has been taken up by the religious newspapers; but they find a difficulty in agreeing to an answer. They want a spiritual court, yet they dread it; because they know that the great majority of bishops, deans, and archdeacons, and—as is always certain to be the case—that the

Archbishops of Canterbury and York would be opposed to all extravagances in Ritualism. So the religious newspapers try to "hedge" their admissions. The truth is, they are in an insoluble dilemma. If they take the *judicial* functions from the State and transfer them to the two houses of Convocation, or if they take the *legislative* functions from the State and transfer them to the same Anglican two houses, they are in this plight: that a decision once given as to doctrine or as to ritual would amount to a sort of *causa finita est.* And imagine a *causa finita est* in the Church of England! This would mean the investing of the houses of Convocation (judicially) with what would practically be the imputation of infallibility; it would be, in short, a transference of the *imperium* of private judgment to the *imperium* of a pseudo-Catholic authority. But this would mean the transferring of *all* Protestantism to a pseudo or home-made kind of Catholicity; such a Catholicity meaning simply the opinion of Convocation, *minus* Pontiff, *minus* Council, *minus* Christendom. The Church newspapers see this. They are therefore "cornered" by the Dean of Windsor, who asks bluntly: "Name any tribunal you *would* accept." They would rather not name any tribunal. The Catholicity of Anglicanism does not admit of tribunals, which would smash up Ritualism quite as much as Low Churchism. So the church newspapers write cautiously as to the necessity of a spiritual court; and while deploring the just charge of *anomia* which is brought against Anglicanism as it is, only beg for some "qualified" tribunal, "endowed by the united Convocations of Canterbury and York with spiritual jurisdiction." This is obviously unreal. Whence would the united Convocations get their power of conferring jurisdiction? They must be pre-supposed to have jurisdiction, if they could confer it. If they have it, whence did they get it? Neither Queen Elizabeth nor Queen Victoria has ever been credited with a spiritual power to confer what they could not possibly possess; so that unless some new fountain of jurisdiction were discovered, bubbling up out of the waters of tribulation, we cannot even imagine whence the "endowment" is to proceed which the "united houses" are presumed to be able to "pass on." No wonder there is a shyness in the Church newspapers. It is one thing to deplore *anomia*, but another to remedy it. Would it not be better—more honest—to say outright: "We are Anglicans; we like to do things in our amateur way; so please leave us alone to have a state trial now and then, which will give us the appearance of being martyrs, though it will really only increase our importance."

Meanwhile, let us speak in praise of one good argument of the Ritualists, who are now contending both with the State and with Low Churchmen. They say to their opponents: Why should

you not prosecute the Dean of Westminster for allowing images of the Blessed Virgin and her Divine Child to be "restored" to the north transept of Westminster Abbey, the dean having actually authorized the restoration? Or why should you not prosecute the Dean of St. Paul's Cathedral for allowing his "priests" to turn their backs upon the people, to genuflect before their consecrated elements, and generally to behave themselves in a way which fifty years ago would have been regarded as indicating insanity? Well, the reason why you do not prosecute them, say the Ritualists, is because the *doctrines* which are preached at Westminster and at St. Paul's are so painfully broad or indefinite that no one could suspect the clergy of being "Catholics." Every one knows the symbolism to be only æsthetic—the mere prettiness of the official temples of state Protestantism.

But to return to the bishop's trial: is there *no* good to be got out of it? Yes, it must lead to a large number of conversions. Let us suppose the only two possible issues: the bishop will be pronounced innocent or guilty. How can either issue lead to conversions?

First, let us suppose the bishop to be condemned. Then, in the words of Lord Halifax, "the archbishop will have ruled the sacramental principle out of the Church," or will have decided that "there is no sacerdotal character in her clergy." It is tolerably certain that the Bishop of Lincoln would not "appeal," since his appeal could be made only to the Privy Council. The subject, therefore, would drop. And how would the Ritualist party accept the issue? They would have got what they always said they desired to get, a judgment on ritual by a spiritual court. Would they submit? Would they give up all that they have been fighting for during twenty years? Is it likely that, being a powerful party, which has won its victories by sheer insistance on its own will against bishops as well as against laity, it is going to yield everything at a first rebuff, obtained, remember, at the request of extreme Protestants? True, there is this difficulty: that the condemnation would make it impossible for Anglican bishops to veto future actions against Ritualists; so that one result would be an enormous increase in litigation; a sort of chronic crusade of Ritualism against the bishops. But this would not make most Ritualists unhappy. They would rather like to be in perpetual hot water. Next to commanding the Anglo-Catholic Church, they would enjoy perpetual warfare against its commanders. Of course, we are not speaking of the sincere Ritualists, but of that very large body which looks on contention as martyrdom, or which likes the formula, "*L'Eglise, c'est moi.*"

But take the other hypothesis: Say the court pronounced in

favor of the bishop. Is it likely that the Protestant Church Association would rest content with such an injurious decision? They would immediately carry the case "on appeal" to the Judicial Committee and would beg for a reversion of the judgment. Would they get it? We may regard it as almost certain that they would do so. For, in the first place, were the Judicial Committee to even consent to re-hear the case, it would be consenting to reconsider a variety of practices upon which it had already given judgment. There is nothing that is positively new in the bishop's case, scarcely anything that has not been included in past judgments. Such details as are new are unimportant. We can hardly suppose, then, that the Judicial Committee would approve the decision of "the court below," since this would be to make the State say to the Church: "We bow to the spiritual court as to our superior, and humbly accept the fatherly correction it has given us;" a not very likely attitude for that Church-creating English State which has pursued precisely the opposite course for three centuries. But, say that the State took another line—a very much more likely and consistent line—and simply ordered the archbishop to reverse his judgment and to proceed to condemn the Bishop of Lincoln. This would create two "pretty quarrels," the State *versus* the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Archbishop of Canterbury *versus* himself. If the archbishop should refuse to obey the State, the State would pass the judgment of its own accord; at least, it would cause its decision to be known, even if it did not proceed to judgment. But if the archbishop should consent to pass the judgment, and should thus stultify his own court and his own conscience —but no! such a thing would be quite impossible; self-respect would render obedience out of the question. Anyway, whatever turn the trial may take, it must demonstrate the sectarianism of the Church of England. All earnest men will have pursued the subject to the bitter end, and will have learned at last that the Church of England cannot be Catholic.

It is for this reason that we look for many conversions to the Church from the "revelation" which this "august trial" must afford. In truth, the comedy of the "august trial" should be in itself a revelation to every man whose sense of humor is not paralyzed. How can a religion be both ridiculous and true? When St. Gregory Nazianzen said to some heretics of his time, "Give me leave to be merry on a merry subject," he certainly knew of nothing in his own time so mirth-provoking as the "august trial" of the thoroughly amiable Dr. King. Here we have a bishop of a State-Church, which was created by Queen Elizabeth in the sixteenth century, claiming to be judged by the bishops in convocation, in preference to being judged by his archbishop; while all the

while his own counsel is pleading *before* the archbishop, that, up to the time of Queen Elizabeth, the Pope alone decided questions about bishops. This same counsel insists on quoting authorities for his opinions, which authorities lived in purely Catholic times; so that at one and the same moment he contends that the Church of England is the same Church as was the Church of St. Gregory, of St. Anselm, of St. Edmund, of St. Thomas Becket, and yet that the jurisdiction was solely Pontifical in their days, while in these days it is solely Anglican or political. We will not go through the *catena* of "absurdities," which we should wish that "Euclid" could have neatly expressed for us in corollaries. To keep only to the one point of jurisdiction: *Ex nihilo nihil fit*, seems a very safe postulate; and can any Anglican even so much as hazard a conjecture as to whence jurisdiction *could* have come to Convocation, any more than to the Archbishop of Canterbury? Where was the source? Where the beginning? There is, of course, all the difference in the world between a disciplinary and a doctrinal tribunal; the former might play any pranks that it pleased; it could only persecute, only enforce, it could not teach. But as to a doctrinal tribunal, unless it begin with Divine authority, unless it can trace its Divine origin and can prove it, no man would be in his senses who should permit it to dictate to him, saying: "This shall you believe, and nothing else." Now let us grant to Convocation the disciplinary power. [It has it not; but let us suppose that it may gain it.] What would this have to do with its power of teaching doctrine, of "dogmatizing" about this or that heresy? For, of course, we all know—though the subject is not pressed, because it would be inconvenient to press it—that these questions about ritual are really questions about doctrine, questions about *all* that is meant by "priesthood." They are questions about sacrifice, about holy communion, about absolution, about the right or wrong *credo* of the Catholic Christian. Who gave to the present Anglican Convocation the power to decide any one point of belief, so as to rule it as an article of the faith? Is it heresy to believe this, to deny that? and if so, by what authority does Convocation affirm, when ruling, that a particular tenet is heretical?" "Convocation has spoken, the cause is ended?" We know that no Anglican can answer the question. So the only way of evading the whole difficulty is to assume that the teaching-power is not required; because, the early councils having settled every doctrine, all we can now want to know is the right ritual.

This is evasion. It purposely ignores the whole question of a living Divine authority, as distinct from a fossilized establishment. It purposely ignores such a variety of questions as *when* was the Church a teaching Church? *how* did it come to lose the power to teach? *why* should it not now be required to teach? or *who* says

that it ought not now to wish to teach? Seeing that there is much more heresy now in the world than there ever was [in England alone there are 250 sects], it follows that there must be much more need now than there ever was for a Divine, that is, an infallible, teacher. "No," say Anglicans; "no such need can exist, for the simple reason that the Church of England is not infallible." A very pretty answer, indeed; not unlike the answer of a sea-captain who should affirm: "There can be no necessity for a ship to have a rudder, because my ship can get on the rocks without one." So, as Anglicans will not hear of a teaching Church, they fall back on a spiritual interpreter of Church rubrics; and, as they have not got one, they grow wroth with the Privy Council, which kindly offers to do the work for them, when requested. Gravely, we cannot see why the Privy Council should not perform such a purely critical task with due efficiency. If the Privy Council were asked to settle a question of doctrine,—to rule an article of the Anglican faith for Anglicans only,—there might be reasonable objection that the clergy were the best judges of what suited the tastes and prejudices of the British public. But in a mere matter of an interpretation of a ritual-rubric, a lawyer should do it as well as an ecclesiastic. The truth is that the jumble of the whole matter arises from not stating, fairly and honestly, that what is wanted is not the interpretation of rubrics, but the adapting of old rubrics to new doctrines. The same old-fashioned rubrics have done good service for Evangelicals, through long years before even Puseyism was heard of; no one ever thought of prosecuting an Evangelical because he did not found Roman practices on Protestant rubrics; so that it is late in the day to begin to ask the question, "Cannot these same rubrics, which have always justified ultra Protestantism, be made to justify ultra Ritualistic practices?" We are not surprised that the Privy Council says: "No; they cannot." And we should be surprised, too, if Convocation,—supposing it should ever come to have the power,—should assent to some such strange decretal as the following: "The Anglican rubrics were evidently designed to enforce a theory of worship, which about two centuries of Anglicans have never dreamed of; therefore, as we must approve the Ritualistic theory, we feel it our duty to pass sentence of deprivation on all the clergy who *have* lived during the last two centuries."

"Which is absurd." But who made it so? It is such considerations as these which seem to point to the probability that a number of earnest Ritualists will now "submit." They have held out long enough to justify their consciences in having tried their utmost to believe in the Church of England; but now that it is proved to be "absurd," past all hope of fresh apologies, fresh theories, we believe that many of them will throw off the conventional

mask and see themselves and their "Church" in clear sunlight. The novelty, of course, of the present "trial" is that it is a bishop, not a mere rector, who is being tried. We have shown that, whichever way the trial may issue, its lessons must be equally emphatic; that an approval of the new doctrines would be an anathema on the old Anglicanism; while a condemnation would settle the question of Catholicity. Is it necessary to put such reasonings more amply? What has been said, though, perhaps, only suggestively—for it would take volumes to elaborate each point—amounts, in brief digest, to such an argument as the following, if we can put it into just a very few lines:

(1) Fifty years ago the "trial" would have been impossible; because no bishop ever dreamed of a ritual which should symbolize Catholic, Roman doctrine; on the contrary (2), the Protestantism was so national, so profound, that the *mis-en-scène* of Anglican churches was made to "symbolize" the deep loathing which the whole nation entertained of the thought of Popery. In the same spirit (3) the preaching in Anglican churches was always, primarily, anti-Roman, that is, Protestant; the smallest sympathy with one specifically Roman doctrine being regarded with as much horror as was the Inquisition. Now (4), this Church of, say 1839, was either the same Church as is the Church of 1889, or else it was a different and a contrary Church. If it was the same Church, then two contrary national creeds must necessarily constitute one and the same national Church; but if it was a different Church, then there is no link between "Anglo-Catholicism" and the Church which Queen Elizabeth founded, any more than there is any link between the Church of 1839 and the Catholic Church of, say, the time of Henry VII. But (5) the Bishop of Lincoln has assured us that, in the Church of England, there is the Englishman's "inheritance in the Catholic Church"; so that we are bound to conclude that this "inheritance" has been in abeyance, has been dormant, for the greater part of that Church's existence; and that only quite recently have even Anglican bishops made the discovery that the Church of England has been Catholic without knowing it. Or, to put another interpretation on this Catholicity, the Church of England is equally Catholic when anathematizing Roman doctrines, and when copying them as closely as she can; when turning altars into barren tables (with holy communion once a quarter), churches into pewed barns, priests into ministers, sacrifice into remembrance, seven whole sacraments into two half sacraments, and when decking out her priests in Roman chasubles, and her bishops in Roman mitres, Roman robes, that they may "say Mass," and affect to preach "all Roman doctrine." Such a pleading, utterly staggering as it must seem, is made to gather additional confusion

from the "legal argument"; (6) the bishop's advocate, Sir Walter Phillimore, having urged that the Church in England, up to the time of the so-called Reformation, always referred its episcopal difficulties to the Holy See, which was the sole fountain of spiritual jurisdiction, as well as the sole final authority known to Englishmen up to the time of Henry VIII. From which pleading of the bishop's advocate we are bound to conclude—adopting the Ritualist method of severe reasoning—that the present Archbishop of Canterbury, who not only repudiates the Holy See, but often reads it a lesson in sound doctrine, is Metropolitan of the same Church as was St. Anselm or St. Edmund, and believes all that they believed and that they taught. (7) And when, turning from this strange confusion on the part of the clergy of the Establishment, we asked, what do the laity think of "the trial," we found that the laity (as was natural) were in quite as dire an inextricability as were the pastors and masters of things spiritual. Lord Carnarvon, who believes only in "comprehensiveness," and ridicules the idea of a spiritual court, "as fitted rather for Utopia than for modern England" (an estimate in which we entirely concur), is, practically, in the same mind and in the same muddle as the Dean of Windsor, who asks the Ritualists, "Name any tribunal you *would* accept." The laity are worse off than sheep who have no shepherds, for they are sheep whose various shepherds are always quarreling, and who, still more curiously, have to be taught by the sheep what is the proper rule and method of shepherding. The *Saturday Review*, which calls the Establishment "the greatest example of a true Church, at once Catholic and national, that the world has ever seen"; the *Church Review*, which *waits* for a Court of Appeal which shall satisfy both Church and State"; the *Rock*, which says that the Ritualists, if in ascendency, "would begin to tear each other's throats as vigorously as they have hitherto been rending the Church of England"; the church lawyers, who cannot find *where* its jurisdiction, nor *whence* it can possibly have been derived, nor *who* can have first given it, or have first withdrawn it; the old-fashioned "good Churchmen," who have no more idea of the difference between a doctrinal and a disciplinary tribunal than they have of the difference between a dogma and a tradition; all these, and numerous other sections of Anglican laity, are howling in the wilderness *with* their shepherds, while the shepherds are howling for themselves more than for the sheep. (8) Finally, whatever the issue of this so-called trial of a bishop, the result must be absolutely fatal to the Ritualists. A favorable judgment would only hand them over to the temporal power, which would say, "*We* have at least as good a jurisdiction as *you* have, for you could have none from the founders of your communion; you have only the

jurisdiction which Queen Elizabeth bequeathed to you, while we have our jurisdiction from Queen Victoria." Or, if the judgment of Convocation should be unfavorable, all that would happen would be, in the words of Lord Halifax, that Convocation "would rule the sacramental principle out of the Church," and the only result would be—with the great body of the Ritualists—that they would compassionate "poor benighted Convocation," and look forward to "more Catholic" houses by and by.

This is about the pith of the whole matter. Earnest Ritualists will certainly now leave the ship, which, in addition to having no rudder and no captain, has all its sails set for different points of the wind; while such is the wholesale mutiny or disaffection that even a skipper, or a cook, or a cabin-boy can "prosecute" a chief officer of the ship, and the nominal captain has to admit, "I am no captain; you must refer the matter to the shipowners in the city of London." This is the Church! And not only the Church, but the Catholic Church. This is the "Second Incarnation." This is the institution which Christ died to found, and with which He promised to be to the end of time. No, the poor Church of England is in its dotage. It has lived nearly three centuries, and having tried every possible shift of doctrine and of ritual, having right-about-faced a thousand times, having never known what it did believe or ought to teach, while always protesting against the Church from which it revolted, it has at last taken up with this final attitude in which it would be but decorous that it should expire: "As the Catholic religion is true, and as we cannot find out what the Catholic religion is, it follows that the Catholic religion is unknowable."

JANSENISTS, OLD CATHOLICS, AND THEIR FRIENDS IN AMERICA.

Catéchisme Catholique. Publié par le Rév. Père René Vilatte, et approuvé par Mgr. J. H. Hobart Brown, Evêque Catholique. 1886.

Livre de Prières Liturgiques, à l'usage des Vieux Catholiques. New York: Imprimerie James Pott et Cie., 14 et 16 Astor Place.

THE Jansenist Church at Utrecht, in Holland, with its pretended archbishop, suffragans, and a handful of adherents, after dragging on a feeble existence for nearly two centuries, was brought into prominence by the countenance and support which the imperial government of Germany gave the little body of professors and priests who refused to acknowledge the decrees of the Vatican Council. They assumed the title of Old Catholics, which was odd enough for new heretics. Like the bodies who broke away from the Scriptures and the Church in the 16th century, these people, having no bishops, had no means of perpetuating the ministry; and, while professing to believe in seven Sacraments, and of course in Holy Orders, found themselves in the peculiar position of a Church believing in the Apostolic Succession, in the Episcopate, and in ordination by the bishop's hands, but without a bishop. They were, indeed, acephaloi, an Episcopal Church without an Episcopate.

They proceeded to elect bishops, and the question was, where these men were to obtain episcopal consecration. Protestant attempts to obtain consecration at the hands of bishops in oriental churches did not inspire much hope of success in that quarter. To ask it of the Anglican bishops was to avow themselves Protestants, when they denied that they really were so. They then turned to the little schismatic church in Holland, founded in 1723 by seven Jansenist priests, who, assuming to be the chapter of the Cathedral of Utrecht, a see swept away at the time of the so-called Reformation and never restored, proceeded to elect one Steenhoven archbishop of that dormant bishopric. To obtain episcopal consecration, Van Steenhoven applied to one who had been a missionary in Illinois, Dominic Mary Varlet, who, after ministering at Cahokia, became Vicar-General of Quebec for the Mississippi Valley, and stood so high that he was appointed and consecrated Bishop of Ascalon and coadjutor to the Bishop of Babylon. While on his way to the east, having become, by the death of its incumbent, bishop of the latter see, he was summoned to Rome, where it had been ascertained, somewhat too late, that he was an avowed Jan-

senist, and actively working with the leaders of that sect. Instead of obeying the order of the Sovereign Pontiff, he retired to Holland, and there committed the crime of sacrilegiously consecrating as Archbishop of Utrecht a priest chosen by a self-constituted body, without any bulls of the Pope or confirmation of the election. As death removed the pretended Archbishop of Utrecht, the wretched Varlet consecrated others. To keep up a succession, one of the pseudo-archbishops established sees at Haarlem and Deventer, and consecrated bishops for them. This was the utterly irregular, schismatical, and sacrilegious source to which Reinkens, chosen bishop by the Old Catholic party, applied for consecration.

Some Protestant-Episcopal writers in this country lay great stress on the necessity of consecration by three bishops. According to their theory, even, Van Steenhoven's consecration was irregular and void, and the consecration of the first suffragan bishop was no less irregular.

This schismatic Church of Utrecht owed its origin to one who had been a missionary in America. Towards the close of the second decade of this century an attempt was made to create a schism in the Catholic Church in this country, and have a bishop consecrated for Norfolk, Virginia, by the pseudo-Archbishop of Utrecht. In New York, Philadelphia, Norfolk, Charleston, and elsewhere, congregations, or rather trustees pretending to represent congregations, men often utterly ignorant of Catholic doctrine and discipline, and strangers to all practices of religion which the Church requires from her members, claimed the right of appointing priests in the churches where state law authorized them to manage the temporal property of the congregation. The bishops resisted this attempt to introduce a feature of Congregationalism into the Catholic Church. A Dominican stationed at New York, one Father Carbry, was a busy fomenter of these disturbances at Norfolk and Charleston, where troubles lasted for years. They had defeated all efforts of Archbishops Carroll and Neale for the good of religion by upholding unworthy priests against them, and driving away clergymen who were really doing good and reviving religion in the hearts of the people. When the malcontents found that Archbishop Maréchal was even less disposed than his predecessors to yield to the demands of schism and irreligion, Carbry advised them to apply to the pseudo-Archbishop of Utrecht. There was at the time an Irish priest, Rev. Father Hayes, O.S.F., who, as agent of the Irish bishops at Rome, had so hotly opposed the plan of giving the English government a veto on the appointments of Catholic bishops in Great Britain and Ireland, that he was ordered by the Papal authorities to leave the Pontifical states. Carbry supposed that he had a pliant tool in this priest, but if Mr.

Hayes had been intemperate in language, carried away by his zeal for the safety of the Church in Ireland, he was no hypocrite and no traitor. When he received from Carbry a letter urging him to go to Utrecht and be consecrated Bishop of Norfolk, Rev. Mr. Hayes at once laid the letter before the authorities at Rome. That ended the first attempt to plant here a branch of that wretched little schism which never has had five thousand adherents, one of the pseudo-bishops, who claims the See of Deventer, not having a priest or adherent in his imaginary diocese.

It will scarcely be credited that an attempt has been recently made in this country to introduce the progeny of this Holland schism, the moribund Old Catholic schism, among Catholics in this country, and that the scheme originated with, and has been managed, by the once respectable Protestant Episcopal Church, with an amount of duplicity that has nothing to equal it in the whole religious history of America. The Catholic Church has had violence shown it in deed and word. Churches, convents, and institutions have been destroyed. Libels of the grossest immorality have been sent broadcast to embitter the ignorant against her. But for a Protestant body to sneak in among Catholics and impose on them by sending men to teach a corrupted Catholic doctrine and pretend to be Catholic priests, has never had a precedent. This system of hypocrisy and double dealing certainly cannot appeal to the sense of honor, truth, and decency in any man. It is a case that admits of no excuse and no palliation.

One René Vilatte, who had been for some time in Canada, went to the Western States, where he entered a house of the Alexian Brothers, and subsequently became cook among the brothers of St. Viateur, at Bourbonnais, Kankakee County, Illinois. Here he seems to have fallen in with Chiniquy, and resolved to work under him. In 1884 he went to Green Bay, and began to preach in the French Presbyterian Church, and to distribute Chiniquy's tracts among the French Catholics. He did not succeed, however, to any extent, and in August obtained ordination as a Presbyterian minister. He soon made an addition to his chapel, and in October invited Chiniquy to come and dedicate it. He was ere long lecturing against the Catholic Church at Green Bay, Fort Howard, Marinette, and other points in Wisconsin. This seemed to close his career as a Presbyterian, for early in 1885 it was announced that this gentleman had seen the error of Presbyterianism, and had been received into the Protestant-Episcopal Church by Bishop Brown, of Fond-du-Lac, who was soon reported to have ordained him deacon. But whether this was really so or not, Bishop Brown did not give him priest's orders in the Episcopal Church. He had no use for him as an Episcopal minister, having no French Episcopalians for such a

clergyman to minister unto. The field where Bishop Brown proposed that Vilatte should work, and where the ex-Presbyterian minister proposed to work, was among the French-speaking Belgians who had settled on the peninsula between Green Bay and Lake Michigan. Vilatte had learned by experience that a Protestant minister, as such, could not effect much among these people. It seemed to him and Bishop Brown that if he could go in the guise of a Catholic priest, he might meet with some success. It was therefore devised that he should go to Europe and obtain ordination from Herzog, Old Catholic pseudo-bishop in Switzerland.

To tell his real antecedents, his recent conversion from Presbyterianism, would not do; hence pretty little romances like the following found their way to papers in the east and west, and the man who had been a Presbyterian in 1884, was represented as having been a Seminarian in a Catholic theological seminary in 1885, when in fact he had never been one at all.

"It was in 1885 that a young man who had been educated as a Seminarian at Paris came to America to complete his studies for the Roman priesthood. After he had finished these studies, and when within a few months of his ordination, he reached the conclusion, though not breaking with the Roman authorities, not to enter the Roman priesthood. His sister was the mother superior of a convent in Paris, and all his fortunes were in the line of the Roman communion, but his convictions more and more led him into dissent from the doctrine of papal infallibility, and without the slightest rupture with the Roman bishop, under whom he was preparing for holy orders, he quietly withdrew. It was some little time before he found his bearings. He had already seen a field white for the harvest among the French-speaking Belgians, and his convictions as a Catholic led him to think of establishing modified Roman Catholic services among them. In his perplexity he wrote to Père Hyacinthe in Paris, who suggested that he should come to Europe to receive his ordination at the hands of Bishop Herzog of the Old Catholic Church, and should then return to America and place his services at the command of the Anglican bishop of the west, in whose diocese lay the communities where he thought that there was a field for his efforts. Bishop Brown was not more surprised than delighted to find that this young priest had come to him at the very time when he was in the greatest quandary as to the best methods, if any were possible, for reaching a people who were slipping away from Christianity, and for whose instruction no provision could be made. Young Père Vilatte offered to go among these Belgian farmers and see what he could do."

Certain it is that Vilatte returned, having been ordained by Bishop Herzog in June, 1885, on the recommendation of Bishop

Brown, styling himself Catholic Bishop of Fond-du-Lac, but was received by Bishop Brown and sent as an Episcopal minister under Catholic colors to seduce Belgian Catholics from the Church, and of course, in time, make them Episcopalians. A pamphlet published in connection with Vilatte's mission admits this fraud and dishonesty. It says: "This course was decided upon on account of the religious prejudices on the part of the Belgians for whose religious wants Bishop Brown had selected him. If he had gone as an American priest among them, he would have been ignored as a Protestant minister. Anglican orders, particularly when derived from an episcopate officially styled 'Protestant,' are in disrepute with all Roman Catholics; the very name of Protestant is hateful and makes them shrink back; in short, they will have nothing to do with anything connected with Protestantism. On the other hand, Old Catholic orders, like the Greek, are held to be valid by them. The Bishop of Fond-du-Lac had the sagacity to see this and decide accordingly."

It is a pity the bishop was not guided by his sense of truth and honesty, rather than by his sagacity. Bishop Brown in his own name wrote in July, 1885: "In this diocese English-speaking people are in the minority. We have masses of Germans, Belgians, Hollanders, Welsh, Danes, Swedes, Poles, Norwegians. In some districts English is hardly known. This state of affairs is very trying to the diocese, as missions and parishes succumb to the foreigner and new work is difficult. I have long felt that the Church ought to meet the stranger and be his guide and friend, and that then his children would become hers. Near Green Bay are thirty thousand Belgians, French-speaking of course. Many of these, I am told,—six or eight thousand,—are somewhat affected by the Alt Katholik movement. An unusually intelligent and sagacious young Frenchman offered himself to me as a missionary to these people. His acquirements being sufficient and the urgency great, I determined to send the young gentleman to Bishop Herzog. The object was two-fold. First, to save discussion as to authority. We had reason to think that all Alt Katholik ministrations would be welcomed. Ours would be questioned. Next, we wished to win the immigrants of mature age, men and women with religious habits formed and with prejudices fixed and not likely to ever learn the English language. . . . . If we get *them*, the next generation will be with *us* thoroughly."

Vilatte, after an essay of his powers at Green Bay, went to Little Sturgeon, and opened a church under the title of the Precious Blood, and here Bishop Brown soon came to lay the corner-stone of a seminary, for French something, whether Episcopal ministers avowed, or Old Catholic priests ostensibly, it is not easy to say.

Appeals were made in the east and means obtained to carry on the work. Then a Catechism and Prayer-Book were printed for the use of the new church. The Catechism bears the express approbation of Dr. Brown, who again styles himself Catholic Bishop. "Catechisme Catholique. Publié par le Rév. Père René Vilatte, et approuvé par Mgr. J. H. Hobart Brown, Evêque Catholique." Then a Cross with rays; a text from St. Matthew xxiv., 30, and the date 1886.

The prayer-book printed for his mission was one compiled by M. B. Vimeux, of Geneva, and approved by Herzog. The title is less deceptive than that of the Cathechism: "Livre de Prières Liturgiques, à l'usage des Vieux Catholiques." It does not, indeed, bear the name of Bishop Brown as the Catechism does, but was issued from a well-known Episcopal publishing house in New York, and was undoubtedly used with his full sanction.

Now let us see into what strange inconsistency and double dealing the desire to seduce Roman Catholics from their Church led this bishop. The Articles of Religion in his Book of Common Prayer used in his English-speaking churches declare that the Nicene creed ought to be received.

The Little Sturgeon French prayer-book mutilates the creed and virtually denies the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son.

In the English prayer-book (Art. xx.) images and invocation of saints are condemned as repugnant to the Word of God, but in the French Catechism, approved by the Bishop of Fond-du-Lac, is the question: "Does this Commandment (second) forbid honoring the Blessed Virgin and the Saints"? "No, for honoring the Blessed Virgin and the Saints is not adoring them or making idols of them."

In the English-speaking churches of his denomination the people were taught (Art. xxv.): "Those five commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel"; but at Little Sturgeon he authorized this teaching: "How many Sacraments are there"? "There are seven Sacraments: Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony."

The Episcopalians in that part of Wisconsin were taught in their Book of Common Prayer that the "Sacrifice of Masses were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits" (Art. xxxi.); and yet, in the Catechism approved by a bishop habitually using the Book of Common Prayer, is a chapter devoted to the Mass, in which, contradicting the English prayer-book, it says: "The Mass is not only a memorial of the Last Supper, for in the Mass Jesus Christ

really exists under the forms of bread and wine after the consecration."

The French prayer-book opens with "Rubrics of Mass," contains "The Ordinary of the Mass" with prayers "In Masses for the Dead," Introits, Collects, etc., for the Sundays of the year, and for "Feasts of Mary," for Festivals of Saints, for All Souls, and a Mass for the Burial of the Dead.

The Catechism, though it rejects the authority of the Pope and exalts that of the Ecumenical Councils, advocates the marriage of the clergy and Mass in the vernacular, retains more of Catholic faith and discipline than the prayer-book of Vimeux, and shows more clearly the design of deceiving and entrapping the unwary; while once within the toils, a congregation could be easily led to substitute the French Book of Common Prayer, in use in the French Episcopal Church in New York, for Vimeux's, and the Catechism would disappear. These books were but scaffolding to aid in erecting the building, and destined to be pulled down, with very little regard, when the edifice was completed.

But how could an honest man in the position of a bishop of the Protestant-Episcopal Church authorize or encourage such contradictory teaching; profess the procession from the Father and the Son in his diocese generally, and yet impugn it in certain places; condemn the veneration of the Blessed Virgin and the Saints as anti-Scriptural, and yet commend and justify it; declare that there are only two Sacraments and declare that there are seven; deny and admit that Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony and Extreme Unction are Sacraments, and yet teach that they are really Sacraments; denounce the Mass as "a blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit," and yet uphold it in Catechism and prayer-book? Is there an example anywhere in this country of any denomination putting forward, at once, such contradictory doctrines? It cannot be pleaded that the Thirty-nine Articles had grown obselete, like the Augsburg Confession in a Lutheran prayer-book, and that it was retained merely as a monument of bygone days; for no one will pretend that the Episcopalians of the diocese of Fond-du-Lac profess to honor the Blessed Virgin and the Saints by invoking them or keeping their images; or believe in Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony and Extreme Unction as Sacraments; or hear Mass as the great act of public worship of the new law in which Christ is really present after consecration.

These are not points held by the Episcopalians of Fond-du-Lac diocese, and to send a minister to teach them, and to approve the teaching, while holding contrary doctrine, or really holding these doctrines, and habitually denounce them, is a strange position for any man of uprightness and honesty. Are we to infer that it is

claimed that in the attempt to diminish the number of Catholics, any falsehood, calumny, trick, or fraud is permissible, or what is more, to be encouraged and believed?

It is certainly to give unbelievers who scoff at Christianity some pretext for their conduct, when they can appeal to such double dealing in defiance of all moral honesty, as being practised and defended by professing Christians.

The diocese of Green Bay has always been one where the Catholic bishops have had great difficulties to encounter in the general poverty and scattered condition of the faithful, as well as in the multitude of languages spoken. The bishop has to find priests able to give instructions and hear confessions in English, French, German, Holland Dutch, Walloon, Bohemian, Polish, and Menominee. In a small congregation of a hundred families a priest may find three languages necessary for the exercise of the ministry. It was not easy to obtain priests able to take charge of these missions, or to prevent their becoming discouraged when they found even the scanty allowance expected by a priest almost impossible. Hence, there were occasional vacancies, but the charge that the late Bishop Krautbauer, or his successor, Bishop Katzer, has neglected the Belgian Catholics on the peninsula, is utterly unfounded. The Very Rev. Mr. Daems, himself a Belgian, more than thirty years ago, began establishing churches and schools among them. The Sisters of the Holy Cross were the pioneer religious teachers; but Bishop Krautbauer soon felt that the district was one that could be properly attended only by a religious community, and during his administration made constant efforts to find an order that would assume the care of that part of his diocese, and from a central point attend the scattered missions; while he found that stationing priests, as he did at the principal places, all could not be attended frequently enough to maintain faith and devotion among the people. Bishop Katzer, entertaining the same conviction, also sought a community for this mission ground, and succeeded in obtaining a colony of the Priests of Mercy. Priests of this order are now laboring at Green Bay, Bay Settlement, and Rosière, and attend stations at Brussels, Delwiche, Dykesville, Grandlez, Little Sturgeon, Marchand, Martinsville, Robinson, Thiry Daems, Walhain, aided by Franciscan Sisters, who have charge of schools.

Men like Vilatte are not uncommon; "weeds from the Pope's garden" have been and will be taken up among Protestants, who, by encouraging them, hope to do God service. This we know and expect, as a matter of course, and can only deplore the blind credulity which lavishes money on such unworthy men. The injury done to the Catholic Church in this country by such men has

never been comparatively great after they left her bosom; the mischief was wrought chiefly while they remained, discharging a ministry of which they were unworthy.

Vilatte's case is peculiar from the double dealing which he led an Episcopal bishop to practise, and from the curious spectacle of the head of one denomination endeavoring to set up another inconsistent with his own. Vilatte will effect less injury to Catholic souls in Wisconsin than to Protestant pockets in the Eastern States. What will become of him and his projects when the Episcopal Church withdraws, as it must in all decency withdraw, its countenance, and zealous Episcopalians their financial support, cannot be decided. He may return to the Presbyterian fold or try some other Protestant denomination, or may set up as a bishop or lapse into obscurity. In himself he is nothing; for amid a district inhabited by seven thousand Catholics, with all the means placed at his disposal by generous but deluded people, he never succeeded in getting more than twenty families.

The only peculiarity in his case is the fact that he has been able to draw a respectable Protestant denomination into plans and methods hitherto unheard of, and which outspoken ministers in that very body do not hesitate to condemn and denounce with all the energy of upright honesty.

THE FORTHCOMING CATHOLIC CONGRESS.

EIGHTEEN HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-NINE will be memorable for centennial commemorations. The centenary of Bishop Carroll's appointment as Bishop of Baltimore occurs also this year, and will be celebrated with all the ceremonial pomp that his successor, Cardinal Gibbons, assisted by the great body of the hierarchy, can employ to honor the memory of the first Catholic bishop, and, we may add, one of the most patriotic of the original citizens of the United States. The *fête* will begin on the 10th of November in the cathedral of Baltimore, and will be terminated in Washington the following Wednesday, when the new Catholic University will be inaugurated. The anniversary will be further signalized by the meeting of the first Congress of the Catholic laymen of the United States. The Congress will meet also in Baltimore, Monday the 11th of November, and adjourn in the evening of Tuesday, so as to permit the members to attend the inaugural ceremonies in Washington the next day.

The idea of the Congress, and of holding it contemporaneously with the Carroll commemoration, was the happy conception of Major Henry F. Brownson, of Detroit, on whom, also, most of the preparatory work has fallen. The three events will make the date a highly conspicuous one in the annals of the Church, and will certainly introduce a new epoch of religious and intellectual progress in this country. On this occasion, the QUARTERLY is obliged to refrain from discussing the larger theme, and to confine its remarks to the Congress. That the deliberations and utterances of such a body should be fruitful of good results is the unanimous opinion of all the ecclesiastical authorities who have been consulted. No discord or unpleasant controversy can arise among intelligent, disinterested men, who have the same ends in view, and contemplate no other means for reaching them than peaceful action and the diffusion of Catholic ideas. At the end of the first century of our government, and of the normal organization of our Church, and the cloudless, rosy dawn of the second century, the prudence of looking before and after is obvious. There are lessons in the past which may be made to illuminate the yet untrodden paths before us. Apart from that, it is highly desirable to bring all our Catholic fellow-citizens, scattered as they necessarily are over an immense area, into organic relation with one another. We are of different origins, of various nationalities, and have hardly as yet a common tongue. In a certain striking way, we are a type of the universal Church—of the Church that was commanded to teach all nations;

which holds that all men are of one blood, and which enfolds and continues to gather into its fold men of all races, nationalities and tongues.

The movement for a lay Congress was formally begun in Chicago last May by a meeting of distinguished Catholic laymen, presided over by Archbishop Ireland, of Minnesota. His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons, and several other active and zealous prelates, had been consulted by the author of the project, and others by Mr. W. J. Onahan, of Chicago. The ecclesiastical rulers, whose counsel was solicited, all declared in its favor, and this gave ample guarantee of its success; because, no doubt, they expressed the opinion of the whole hierarchy. So fortified, the Chicago committee decided to call a preliminary conference of Catholics, lay and clerical, in Detroit for the 5th of June, to mature the plan of organization, mark out the limits of the work contemplated, and formulate and issue the call for the Congress. The conference met on the day appointed in the Catholic Club house in Detroit, and held sessions for two days. There were present representatives of the laity, clergy and prelacy, though the laymen largely predominated. The German, the Irish, and the native-born Catholics were represented respectively by Germans, Irishmen and Americans. The negro race was represented by one of themselves, a man of marked intelligence and zeal, and the Indians by an eloquent missionary priest of the De Smet order. Bishop Marty, of Dakota, was chairman, and Bishop Foley, of Detroit, took a prominent part in the discussions. The outlines of the programme sketched at the Chicago meeting, slightly modified, were approved, and the call for the Congress was ordered to be issued.

The plan of organization and programme of proceedings are broad and simple. Every Catholic, lay and clerical, has the right to sit in the Congress and participate in the discussions, but the President and all the other officers will be laymen. Papers on the following subjects will be written and read by laymen, but will be subject to discussion by the meeting.

"Lay Action in the Church Charities."

"Education."

"Societies."

"Immigration and Colonization."

"Progress of the Church during the Century."

In addition, there will be also, we are informed, some formal expression of sympathy with the Holy Father in his present painful and precarious situation, and a protest against the anomalous conditions imposed on the Apostolic See by the Italian government. Manifestly none of these subjects can be exhaustively treated at the forthcoming meeting, and it is equally evident that but a little

time can be allotted to the discussion of each paper. From the circumstances of the case, these essays must be few and the speeches brief, or the Congress could never be able to fulfil its mission in the two days of its duration. Following the precedent set by similar associations in Europe and America, no vote will be taken on any proposition. It would be unwise to attempt very much at this, the first, Congress. After all, its prime function will be to lay the foundations of a permanent institution like the Congress of the United States itself, which shall meet biennially, or if not, at other stated periods, and be the authoritative and supreme organ of the Catholic laity of the United States.

The actual position of the Holy Father and the Papacy itself are objects of profound solicitude throughout the Catholic world, and not less here in the United States than in other countries, near and far. The opinion of American Catholics should, it seems to us, have at least as much *moral* weight and be listened to with as much attention as the opinion of any equal number of our brethren in the Old World. All the governments on this continent are republican in form and wholly secular. Brazil and Canada are in fact no exceptions, though the head of each the likeness of a kingly crown has on. But, however this may be, no one will deny that our own government is the freest on earth. It is of all governments the most radically secularized, the most thoroughly republican. The great majority of its citizens, its legislators, its rulers, its officials, high and low, in every department, civil and military, are Protestants; and yet it has no more loyal and devoted adherents than its Catholic citizens—none more opposed to any change in its institutions, or to any reactionary policies. Fidelity to the government is an essential part of Catholic teaching, a solemn obligation on the Catholic conscience. Catholic loyalty is rooted in the conscience, and hence the Catholic community is always a tower of strength to every just government, of whatever form, which respects the rights of conscience—failing which, it could not of course be just. Composed as we are of Americans, Germans, Irishmen, Frenchmen, Spaniards, Bohemians, Poles, Italians, Negroes, Indians, we may, without straining the similitude, be considered a microcosm of the Church at large, which in its constitution, spirit, practice, and official *personnel*, transcends and morally obliterates the narrow limitations of nationality and race.

The voice of such a diverse democratic multitude, sympathizing with the Vicar of Christ in his imprisonment, would sound like a sphoral symphony in his ears, and strike elsewhere with the sound of the tempest. In common with all other American citizens, we Catholics have a profound antipathy to any union of the spiritual and temporal power in an individual or a legislature—to

any union of Church and State, but the extent of the power demanded by the Holy Father is simply the power to act freely within the Church, to be master of his own household, so that he may exercise his august office without let or hindrance, whether from Crispi's myrmidons or the emissaries of the secret societies, who abound in Italy, and especially in the city of Rome, and who at bottom are as much the enemies of the Quirinal itself as of the Vatican, for they are all revolutionists and communists. Elevated above mere earthly ambition, the successor of St. Peter (worthy to rank with the greatest of that illustrious line, which counts greater names and a greater number of them than all other dynasties together) stands alone, the representative of the Divine Government, the far-resounding voice of the HIGHER LAW, the Apostle of Peace in the midst of the ominous armed powers that threaten in the near future the well-being of all civilized society and the existence of many nations. From his lofty watch-tower he sees the horizon all around black with the thunder-cloud, and glimmering with steel, and the kings moving stealthily in the lists with lowering looks and hand on hilt, impatient for the fray. Who but HE can oppose those royal and imperial anarchs? He asks for no serried hosts, bristling with bayonets, no far-spreading territory, but simply for that one spot of earth which from time immemorial has belonged to the Papacy and which the experience of centuries has demonstrated to be indispensable for the free, efficient exercise of its spiritual functions, not the least of which are the promotion of peace and good-will among the nations. To say this in firm and moderate language can give no offence in any quarter, and, indeed, we might take shame to ourselves if we suffered the great occasion to pass without enunciating some such sentiment. When the Catholics of every country in Europe, and of several states on this continent, have spoken out boldly on the Roman question, we cannot afford to remain dumb, or speak with bated breath and whispering humbleness. We are not only the peers of all the ages, but of all the races; and as citizens of the United States stand as the foremost files of time, and consequently our attitude on this question will attract universal notice, and give the tone to Catholic sentiment on this continent. Our utterances should be commensurate with our position. We should be equal to the occasion, and have the courage to strike a lofty note in the general chorus. Our proper place is in the foremost ranks of the Catholic movement. The new crusade in behalf of our spiritual sovereign is a civil and moral, not a military one. Peace is the sign on its forehead and the word in its mouth.

Historic Italy is a cherished memory with every enlightened Catholic, a vital thought in every mind, nor is there any sentiment

of hostility or malevolence towards that famous country in the bosom of any class or constituent of the great American people. We would gladly see modern Italy rival the exploits of the republic of ancient Rome and the achievements in arts and letters of the mediæval republics, but unfortunately her ambition seems to be modelled on that of imperial Rome. The baleful spell of militarism, the curse of contemporary Europe, has touched her inmost soul, and we see the flower of her youth waste the best years of life in the training camps and casernes. The time was when reformers and philanthropists shed torrents of crocodile tears over the unhappy condition of Italy, where men and women dwelt for life within convent walls. Although in general the inmates led useful and innocent lives, and contributed their full share to the ample page of knowledge,—to literature, philosophy and science,—to the fine, the useful and the ornamental arts,—yet the orders and communities of both sexes and the whole monastic system were inexhaustible themes of defamation and denunciation. Throughout Italy, to-day, there are at least a hundred men in the old monasteries (they have been turned into barracks) for the one that dwelt there before. Has Italy gained or lost by substituting a hundred idle soldiers (the soldier is better idle than active) for the one peaceful monk, who worked as well as prayed? Her people are poorer than ever, for taxation is heavier than ever. Her national debt threatens national bankruptcy, and her municipalities are terribly overloaded. Emigration from her ports increases from day to day, and this is the surest evidence of poverty and privation. The radii of the exodus strike many lands—especially France, South America and our own country. Unfortunately for the welfare of her people, she is a member of an alliance that exacts from her military and naval expenditures far beyond her resources. This alliance can put two millions of men in the field on short notice, and has twice as many organized as a rear guard and capable of mobilization. The legions of France and Russia are quite as ready and quite as many. In continental Europe there are, to-day, twelve millions of soldiers who will sleep to-night with their heads upon their swords, as it were, knowing that the tocsin may sound any moment. This is the condition of Europe one hundred years after the French Revolution and its sun-burst of glorious promise, and three hundred and seventy years after the rise of its progenitor, the "REFORMATION," when the new gospel light dawned from Anna Boleyn's eyes! And what oceans of blood have been shed in the meantime! The growth of civilization, forsooth! The idols of the modern peoples seem to be great armies, great empires, immense magnitude—irresistible force. Yet nothing is truer than that great armies and great empires are disastrous to public and

private well-being, industrial progress and intellectual culture. Bigness is not identical with greatness, nor military glory with social happiness, or the pursuit of the true, the beautiful and sublime. Athens was a small republic, Judea a small kingdom. Neither Venice, Florence, Genoa, nor any other Italian republic could boast of extended territory. Aragon and Castile were small states. Yet they all produced great men, and these are the supreme product—the finest flower and fruit of humanity, and the ultimate measure and criterion of worth, when the capabilities of institutions and nationalities are tested. We avail ourselves of the occasion to remark that the doctrine of nationality, which has played so important a part in the political sphere for the last half century, is in its essence reactionary and disintegrating. In the last analysis it means nothing but tribal egotism. What is the good of Welsh nationality, for instance, with its Welsh-speaking press and pulpit, its annual Eisteddfods, with their white-bearded, thin-voiced bards repeating grotesque Arthurian legends in that uncouth dialect of superfluous consonants. High-born Hoel's harp or soft Llewellyn's lay, or any other lay worth the singing, will be heard no more forever in that dialect. The bardic tournaments are as important as were Owen Glendower's incantations.

The effect of it all is to keep the Welsh people isolated and intellectually stagnant in the fastnesses of their mountains, while the great world, unseen, unheard, spins forever down the ringing grooves of change. It is true, there may be magic in it when the invader comes; and to the end of time the song and story which tell of the heroic deeds of their ancestors will be the most highly prized ballad-literature of every people; but that is all.

What do we see when we turn to the greatest empire, the greatest nationality in the world, judging it by the size of its territory, the number of its population, and its longevity as a state? The Chinese, in their own estimation, are infinitely superior to all others. They are celestials, while all the rest of us are terrestrials. They cherish the deepest contempt for the outside world of barbarians, especially for Europeans and Americans, whom they politely call foreign devils. By their exclusiveness, they have walled themselves in from all free and healthy contact with civilized life and the Christian nations. They are utterly debased, superstitious, cruel, and poverty-stricken. In its immobility, China is a monument of the petrifying power of nationality, and of the impotence of the principle by itself to exalt or advance a community, morally or intellectually, or even to secure the material well-being of the commonalty.

Only at our peril can we refuse to take note of the lesson which is writ large and many times on the historic page. The nations

and tribes who were forced to submit to the Roman yoke gained much more than they lost. They received the language, laws, and institutions of Rome in exchange for their barbaric independence and national customs. On the ruins of the rude tribal polity and traditions rose the fair edifice of Roman civilization. The Etruscan, the Ligurian, the Gaul, the Briton, the Iberian, the Numidian, the Goth, became Roman, each to his own great benefit. It is remarkable that the countries trodden by the legions, the places where the eagles dwelt, on the Rhine, the Danube, the Seine, the Thames, and elsewhere, are still the brightest spots on the map of Europe.

In old composite states like Austria, for instance, the principle of nationality is acting as a solvent, and threatening them with disintegration. It has served, and will continue to serve, as a cloak for territorial rapacity and military adventure. Under its sanction Denmark has been despoiled of Schleswig-Holstein and France of Alsace-Lorraine. Napoleon the Third invoked the principle—to his own ultimate ruin, be it remarked—when he invaded Lombardy. But as soon as the Austrians were driven into the famous quadrilateral of those days, he coolly turned round and despoiled Italy of Nice. Savoy is French, not Italian, and, properly speaking, was *un pièce rapportê*. Pan-slavism, which is the Russian name for Russian nationality, threatens to swallow up the Balkan states and all southern Europe east of the Adriatic. When the purpose is to enlarge the frontiers, to seize foreign territory, modern state-craft talks loudly of the sacred claims of race and kindred; when the purpose is to hold weaker nationalities in subjection, the principle is cynically ignored. The czar shows no disposition to restore the German provinces on the Baltic to the German empire, or to grant self-government to Poland. Prussia and Austria are equally deaf to the prayers of their Polish subjects. Between Germany, on the one hand, and France, on the other, Holland and Belgium are in a perilous situation, and will hardly survive the next general war. Undoubtedly, the doctrine of nationality has been overrated by publicists as well as poets. Fortunately it has no place in the Constitution, the laws, or the government of the United States. It is also unknown in Switzerland, which is a confederation of Germans, Gauls, Italians, and other less conspicuous denominations. America is free and happy; Switzerland suffers somewhat from the tyranny of fanatical majorities here and there in some of the cantons, but, on the whole, is tranquil and prosperous. The reintegration of Italy has been productive of no material good to the Italians. Nor have they produced a statesman since Cavour, nor have the reigns of Victor Emmanuel and Umberto been accompanied by any literary or artistic renaissance. The

Italian kingdom is undoubtedly a great fact, and, some good folk hope, an enduring one, but the Papacy is also a great fact, and an eternal one. As long as the local secular power overrides, or bullies, or menaces the universal spiritual power, there will be heart-burnings and discontent, and sullen murmurings will be heard far and near, and, in short, a feeling of insecurity and apprehension be widely prevalent. Rome itself, in any sense but the geographical one, belongs much more to Christendom at large than to Italy. To have made it merely the capital of the kingdom was to belittle it—to dim its prestige and ignore its history. There is not a monument or work of art within its mouldering walls; not a fountain, a hospital, or church; not an institution of learning or charity, numerous though they be, that is not indebted to the Popes for its creation or preservation, and indirectly to the Catholics of all ages and nations. Rome is built, stone by stone, of the *oboli* of past generations of Catholics the world over. It is not a national, but an international, centre—the once metropolitan and cosmopolitan city of the globe. May Italy prosper! Let her outshine her former self in great deeds and great works of genius, but above all, and before all, let the VICAR of CHRIST be free! At present he is not free, or even safe. He is perpetually insulted, as he was on Whitsunday last, when the statue of Bruno, the apostate, was publicly unveiled in the presence of a blasphemous rabble shouting for Barabbas. When no man wearing the ecclesiastical garb is exempt from threats and affronts on the streets; when the funeral procession of a deceased Pontiff can proceed on its way only at night, and not then unless guarded by an encircling fringe of bayonets; when dynamite bombs are flung at the pulpits in thronged churches during the Lenten season, it is mockery to talk of a free Church in a free State, or that His Holiness is not held in duress and encompassed by bitter enemies.

How can the modern Italian forget that the Papacy has been the heart and shield, the rock and strong tower of Italy from the day the seat of empire was transferred to Constantinople? Were it not for the Popes there would be no Italy, and the inhabitants to-day would probably be speaking a German or Mongolian dialect. It was the Popes that saved her from Goth, Ostrogoth, and Vandal; from the petrific mace of Byzantine absolutism; from the Hun, the Saracen, and the Turk. Italian nationality survived because it found refuge from every storm in the bark of Peter. And it may find a needed asylum there again when all else fails. The Frank knows the road across the Alps, and by the Ligurian shore; the Hohenzollern may tread in the footsteps of the Hohenstaufen and the Hapsburg; the mighty Czar, who rules a hundred and twenty millions, may, in the course of events, penetrate further

south than Attila, and pitch his tent on the Tiber, or even beneath the shadow of Vesuvius. Judging from her authentic history,—from the days of Brennus and Hannibal to the days of the emperors Francis Joseph and Napoleon III.,—Italy is more subject to invasion than any other country in Europe. It is not at all impossible that the divinity which doth hedge the Vicar of Christ may fall around her as a shining ægis, and be her salvation in the coming time, as it has been in the past.

But vistas of this kind lie far away from our field of vision as Americans. The American invaders of Italy will not be soldiers, but peaceful pilgrims, who will continue to flock thither to visit her shrines of religion and art, and ask the blessing of the Holy Father. In pleading for the independence of the Holy See we would appeal to moral force, not to brute force—to universal public opinion, not to the sword. Dearly prized as the object is, we would employ no means to accomplish it but peaceful means. We would pursue no policy but the wise and noble policy of the great O'Connell. The statesmanship, traditions, and feelings of the American people are utterly opposed to the intervention of our government in the domestic affairs of other countries; and American Catholics are heart and soul in favor of maintaining that wise and salutary principle; but, in common with all our fellow-citizens, we are called upon, from time to time, to exercise the right of expressing ourselves on important international, as well as domestic, questions; of declaring for the right and against the wrong, abroad as well as at home, and in that way of contributing to the advancement of liberal and humane principles, and to the prolongation, if we cannot say the perpetuation, of the TRUCE OF GOD—a measure more urgently called for now, when the front of battle seems to lower, than when the CHURCH first instituted it to bridle the ferocity of feudal warfare.

Among the papers, the historic sketch of the progress of the Church from the days of Carroll to the present time will probably be the most interesting, if not the most important. Bigotry and sectarian animosities were rife during Colonial times, and fear and hatred of the Catholic Church especially. These passions descended to the Republic, and are not quite extinct yet. Nevertheless, the CHURCH has advanced, and continues to advance, by leaps and bounds. One of the chief causes of the phenomenon is the heroic spirit with which she has met trials and dangers. The lineage of her martyrs is unbroken. Every event, every calamity that called for the offices of charity to ameliorate the misery of the afflicted has been heard by willing ears within her fold. Every national crisis, from first to last, has tested and proved the worth and valor of the Catholic body. The revolutionary war crowned the Catholics with honor, and partially burned out Protestant

bigotry. The war of 1812 had a similar effect. The successive visitations of the cholera and the yellow fever were so many glorious battles for the Church. The convent sisters and the priests sought the posts of danger, plunged into the thick of the fight, and, in many cases, lost their lives nursing the plague-stricken and administering the last rites to the dying. This supernatural heroism was a sign and a wonder to thousands who had no love for Catholicity. The champions of the Church have won their immortal garlands in the closed lists of the lazar-houses, where death shook his dart, or out on the battle-field in the midst of the wounded.

We cannot go into the secondary causes of the great growth of the Church, but will remark that the civil war added greatly to her prestige, and well-nigh dispersed all the old prejudices. This was made evident when, not long since, a red-robed cardinal and an archbishop were called upon to participate officially, and offer up prayers to God, at a great national commemoration. The manifest truth is that the Catholic Church in the United States emerges with new lustre from every ordeal it encounters. It has proved equal to every emergency. It will be a more potent influence in the Conemaugh Valley henceforth than it has been. Pure and heroic lives are great missionaries in this day and country. They always have been, we suppose. Pulpiteering and pamphleteering are feeble in comparison. The Church numbers among her children, in and out of the cloister, men and women of pure and heroic life who are not unwilling to sacrifice themselves, and win the martyr's crown, when occasion calls. The law of the growth of the Church is elucidated by this fact. Of course, our numerical strength is another question, and is largely accounted for by immigration—a cause to which the growth and prosperity of the whole United States are immeasurably indebted. But *emigration* is a forced movement,—a movement impelled by necessity,—and is considered by the emigrant himself and the family a sore hardship and great peril. Yet, in the order of PROVIDENCE, it is one of the laws of human progress, and has been in force from the beginning. We have seen what great results have sprung from it in this country, although its victims have been many, and are once more admonished that GOD continues to make men's necessities instruments for working out a great intent.

Scientific Chronicle.

PHOTOGRAPHY.

PHOTOGRAPHY is now fifty years old. A half century of greater progress and usefulness cannot well be imagined. Interesting in her infancy, but with little promise of her power, she has become the invaluable helpmate of science. This widening of her sphere of usefulness has been chiefly due to the chemist, who, by his untiring labors, has increased the sensitiveness of the photographic plate, and simplified the process of its development. But the optician, by the perfection of his lenses, and the mechanic, by the skill with which he has confined all the necessary mechanical appliances in a neat and compact camera, have contributed greatly to the perfection of the picture, and the universal spread of a process destined to have an important influence on science, literature, and art.

The camera has remained essentially the same, and the relation of its parts is easily understood from the well known comparison with the human eye. The box corresponds to the dark chamber of the eye, while the sensitive plate, held in place at the back of the camera-box, is the retina on which the lens focuses the picture, as the crystalline lens does in the eye. The diaphragm acts as iris and pupil, regulating the amount of light admitted to the lens, while the shutter plays the part of the eyelid. The photographic shutter, though, is about ten times more rapid than the eyelid, an exposure of the $\frac{1}{100}$ of a second being attained. This short exposure is sometimes secured in the following way: In front of the diaphragm two circular shutters rigidly connected are revolved about the same axis by means of a strong spring. A brake holds them in a given position, so that one of them covers the aperture and the other is held some distance above. The brake is attached to a piston fitted in one extremity of a rubber tube, the other end of which terminates in a rubber ball held by the operator. Squeezing the rubber ball, the air in the tube is compressed, the piston raised, and the brake released. The spring revolves the shutters until the upper one has replaced the lower over the aperture, thus exposing the plate during the time it took to effect this change of position. When several instantaneous pictures are to be taken of the successive positions of a body in rapid motion, electricity is employed to regulate the motion of the shutter, as in the case of the Muybridge series of photographs illustrating animal locomotion. In this instance an exposure of $\frac{1}{5000}$ part of a second was secured.

But the chief improvement has been made in the plate. In 1839 Daguerre, a French painter, announced his discovery to the world. His pictures were made in the following way: Exposing a highly polished plate of silvered copper to the vapor of iodine, it became sensitive to light. When such a plate was placed in the camera an invisible image

of an object placed before the camera was printed upon it. This picture was brought out by the action of vapor of mercury, and the plate rendered insensible to the further action of light by washing it in hyposulphite of soda to remove the superfluous salt of silver, and in water to remove the hyposulphite. At the same time, Fox Talbot, in England, made known his discovery of what he called "Photogenic Drawings." He coated writing paper with a solution of common salt. When dry he brushed silver nitrate over it, thus forming silver chloride on the paper. The picture printed on this paper was developed by gallic acid. It was negative, but on covering a similar sheet of sensitive paper with the one on which the negative was made, and allowing the light to act through the latter, a positive was formed.

Thus the action of light on the salts of silver is the basis of the whole operation. The salts employed at present are the bromide and the iodide, but the plate is much more easily coated with the salts than in the processes above described. In 1843, Sir John Herschel had taken a picture of his great telescope on a glass plate. But Niépce de St. Victor advanced this method by employing albumen to hold the salts on the glass. Later, Le Gray suggested the use of collodion instead of albumen, and in 1851 Scott Archer introduced the collodion process in the form in which we find it to-day. At present it is known as the wet-plate process. The plate must be prepared by the photographer, and is used while wet. Collodion, containing soluble iodides or bromides, is poured upon the glass until a thin film of the collodion covers the glass, all superfluous liquid being removed. The plate is then placed in a bath of nitrate of silver. Iodide of silver is formed upon the plate, a coat of the nitrate also adhering to the film. It is now ready for use, and on exposure in the camera a latent picture is printed upon it. Any one of the many developers in use, such as sulphate of iron, poured upon the plate, brings out the picture. Then washing in hyposulphite of soda, and finally in water, it is rendered insensible to the further action of light.

The fact that the operator had to prepare his plate every time he wished to take a picture made the process long, and increased the amount of stock necessary for the photographer. So, a great advance was made by the introduction of the dry plate. M. Gaudin, in 1854, brought out the collodion dry plate, and Dr. R. L. Maddox the far more sensitive gelatine plate in 1871. In this latter gelatine is the vehicle for distributing and holding the silver salts on the plate, which is used while dry. Thus, the photographer can dispense with all that was necessary to prepare the plate, which he can secure ready for use in any photographic supply store. He merely requires the chemicals necessary for developing the picture. The employment of glass as the material on which the negative is formed was a decided advance on account of the transparency of glass. But its weight renders it objectionable. Hence, several inventors have had recourse to different methods of taking negatives on transparent media, which would be light and durable. Oil paper was abandoned, as the structure of the paper interfered with the distinctness of the positive.

The process of stripping the film from a temporary paper back, and using the transparent film to print from, is too troublesome unless done on a large scale. So the most practical method yet devised seems to be that in which celluloid is employed to hold the film. It makes a light, transparent plate, which can be easily retained in proper position while printing.

The chemical action which occurs on the plate under the action of light is a subject of much discussion. The result for the wet plate may be briefly stated thus: On the plate we have iodide (or bromide) and nitrate of silver; the light breaks up the iodide into the subiodide of silver and iodine. The latter is absorbed by the silver nitrate, forming nitric acid and silver iodide. When the plate in this condition is brought to the dark room and washed with ferrous sulphate, the silver nitrate is acted on with the formation of ferric sulphate, ferric nitrate, and metallic silver. The latter is attracted to the parts of the plate acted upon by the light, giving us a metallic silver image of the object. By polishing a positive made on glass the beautiful and brilliant lustre of the image will reveal the fact that it is of metallic silver. The washing of the picture with hyposulphite is to remove the salts of silver which have not been acted upon by the light. The washing in water is necessary to remove the hyposulphite, which would stain the photograph.

Although the method of taking photographs has been simplified, and thousands of amateurs have entered the field, still patience and skill are required to take a good picture. Attention must be paid to the proper lighting of the subject and to the time of exposure. Success in these points will come only after considerable experience. But the advantages to be reaped from success in the art have induced many to study carefully all the requisite conditions, and produce results which have important bearings in the different departments of science.

To photography we owe a great advance in our knowledge of animal locomotion which may be of practical value in the hands of the physician while treating locomotor ataxia, lateral sclerosis, and the like. We have not given up the thought of flying in the air, and if the problem is to be solved, probably nothing will contribute so much to success as the exact knowledge which photography has given us of the flight of birds. The astronomer, too, has called photography to his aid in unravelling the mysteries of the heavens. No great astronomical expedition to observe an important eclipse is now complete without its photographic outfit to record accurately the phenomena. These pictures bring out details which would have escaped the observer. Sir John Herschel is said to have remarked, on looking at a photograph of Saturn taken by Warren De la Rue, that he would die content if he could but once see the planet itself as beautifully defined. It was by means of photography that De la Rue, in 1860, succeeded in locating the prominences in the gaseous envelope around the sun. From two series of photographs taken during the eclipse of that year, one by himself and the other by Father Secchi, S. J., he arrived at this conclusion, which repeated experiments have since confirmed. The first application of photography to

astronomy was made by John William Draper, of New York, on March 23, 1840, when he secured a Daguerreotype picture of the moon. Since that day the camera has been the inseparable companion of the telescope in the observatory, revealing new nebulæ and stars never seen by the eye. But that it may supplant the eye in determining star positions, some substance must be discovered that will preserve the gelatine film with its record from shrinkage.

The physicist calls photography to his aid while examining the spectra of metals, and the rapidity and accuracy with which the spectroscopic lines are recorded is truly marvellous. Where weeks of observation would be required to detect and measure the lines, and where this would be impossible for the eye on account of their great number and delicacy, the sensitive plate makes, in a few minutes, a perfect record which can be examined at leisure by the observer. The valuable spectroscopic maps of Prof. Rowland of Johns Hopkins University are admirable illustrations of the power of photography in this field. The value of an uninterrupted series of observations in the case of continuous phenomena is evident, and the sensitive plate is the tireless watcher that night and day records in our physical laboratories and meteorological observatories the variations in many of our physical forces. A general view of the methods employed may be gathered from the way in which changes in the earth's magnetism are recorded. A magnetic needle is suspended so as to be influenced by the action of the earth. Each variation in the magnetism of the earth causes an oscillation of the needle. A small mirror attached to the needle reflects a slender beam of light to a roll of sensitive paper which is moved slowly by clock-work. This bright spot imprints on the paper every movement of the needle with a faithfulness unattainable by the most skilful observer.

But art as well as science profits by photography. Not that the photograph itself is, strictly speaking, a work of art. It is rather scientific than artistic, for it reproduces with the strictest accuracy every little fact of detail, while it is the aim of the artist to express his subject by employing as few facts as possible. Still, the spread of photography has obliged thousands to study composition or arrangement of parts that they may mutually aid each other in producing a pleasing result, as well as the effect of light and shade, a knowledge of which is necessary for the proper appreciation of a work of art, as well as for its production. An artistic spirit is also fostered by placing in the hands of the public faithful photographic reproductions of the works of great artists. No work of travel is now complete unless the photographs taken by the traveller are reproduced, and literary works are enhanced by copious illustrations which are daily improved by new photographic processes.

A cannon ball moving at the rate of 1200 feet per second has been photographed, the lightning flash has been faithfully recorded and yet we do not seem to have exhausted the possibilities of photography, and achievements in this field during the next fifty years may far surpass those of the half century just closed.

FORESTS AND RAIN-FALL.

In many of the States a holiday has been established by law and is known as Arbor Day. The object of this day of recreation is to foster a love for our forests and to encourage tree-planting in order that the destruction of our trees in the path of advancing civilization may in some measure be compensated for. Hence it is that in many places the school children are instructed to plant trees and to take pride in watching their growth. This is the reaction that must necessarily follow the evils that threaten us if a wholesale destruction of our forests be permitted. We need not go to Europe to learn the sad consequences of disafforesting a country. In the last report of the Forestry Commission of the State of New York we learn that the summer flow of the Adirondack rivers has decreased, within the memory of men now living, from 30 to 50 per cent. That many of the small streams which a quarter of a century ago were abundantly supplied with water during the entire summer are now dry during many months.

This is what might be expected, for in open country the sun acts with its full force on the snow in spring, melts it rapidly, giving rise to early spring freshets and floods which carry devastation in their path and rob the rocks of the soil that covers them. Whereas in forest-covered tracts, the trees shield the snow from the direct action of the sun's rays, it melts more slowly, gentle streams are gradually supplied with water, and much that would have been carried off to the sea by the more rapid surface-drainage has time to penetrate the soil, supplying springs and small streams for months afterwards. Moreover, the rapid denudation of the rocks is thus prevented and much valuable soil preserved for tillage. Similar effects are produced in the case of heavy rains; there is a slow, equable and gradual distribution of the water through the agency of forests, whereas in open country it is drained at once into the beds of the nearest water-courses.

China affords an illustration of the evils that result from destroying the forests. It is a treeless country, visited by devastating floods and by long periods of drought as destructive in their results as the floods. Not long ago the Yellow river overflowed, and with such disastrous consequences that the necessity of increasing wooded areas was forced upon all. The Viceroy, Li Hung Chang, issued a proclamation calling the attention of the people of his province to this fact. The authorities are to furnish trees to the peasants with directions for tree-planting. To encourage the inhabitants to take a lively interest in this enterprise, ten of the benefits that will result from an extension of the wooded areas are printed and circulated with the directions for planting. Chief among these benefits are the reasons which the Viceroy gives for issuing this proclamation. He says a new means of livelihood will be given to the peasants, droughts will be prevented, floods checked, rain-fall regulated and the country beautified.

The evils of forest destruction have long since been felt in Europe, and in 1872 five million young trees were in cultivation in Dalmatia

alone in order to repair the damage. In India the forests produce valuable teak and ornamental woods for cabinet-work, but their destruction produced serious consequences to the climate; droughts, famine, and floods being invariably the result. Algeria repeats the tale of India. So abundant are the facts that there is no difficulty in tracing the relation of cause and effect between the destruction of forests and floods, famine, and droughts. Where attention has been paid to vegetation these evils have been checked. In the French Department of the Hautes Alpes an interesting experiment was tried some years ago. The land had been washed away by the water, the mountain villages abandoned, and in twenty years the population had decreased by eleven thousand. The peasants opposed the replacing of the forests, but were obliged to return the barren districts. This fresh covering of the soil prevented evaporation, and allowed the rain to sink into the earth instead of running off in torrents, washing the soil away with it. The result was most happy. In a few years these districts were covered with a luxuriant vegetation, giving food and shelter to flocks and herds.

Whether forests have a direct influence on agriculture by increasing the yearly rain-fall is much disputed, but as the methods of observation are improved, and the areas over which these observations are made are increased, facts seem to confirm the opinion that they do. For the raising of wheat, for example, a mean yearly rain-fall of twenty inches seems to be generally required, although there are instances of its successful growth with only fifteen inches of rain in the year. This water, where there are no artificial systems of irrigation, must come from the atmosphere. The atmosphere absorbs this water from seas, lakes, rivers, etc., and when saturated, through the agency of the winds, scatters it over the land. But, in many instances, the air is robbed of its moisture before reaching inland districts, and, hence, in these places there will be a deficit of water unless it can be supplied from some other source. Now, forests act as large store-houses of water, and dry winds blowing over them absorb immense quantities of water, which is precipitated over agricultural and grazing lands. The instances of increase of rain-fall coincident with preservation and extension of forest land confirms this opinion. Mr. Henry Blanford, meteorologist to the government of India, in his report for 1885–86, expresses the opinion that the increased rain-fall is due in a great measure to the preservation of the forests. Formerly the natives, in accordance with their nomadic system of cultivation, destroyed large forest tracts by jungle fires, but, in 1875, the government brought these districts under protection, and since then the wooded areas have increased; and coincident with this growth there has been, during the last ten years, an increase of 10 per cent. in the rain-fall. In a valuable report lately published from the Signal Office giving the "Rain-fall of the Pacific Slope and the Western States and Territories," the Chief Signal Officer, Gen. A. W. Greely, deduces from the observations, which range over a period of from two to forty years, that the rain-fall is increasing, and that the forests are a factor in this increase. He says: "The effect of forests as factors in the increase of rain-fall is

more or less questioned, but the weight of opinion and of accumulative evidence tends to confirm the theory that forests do slightly increase the rain-fall. The confining of Indians to reservations has removed one fruitful cause of fires during the last ten years, so that the stunted forests are having an opportunity of increasing the limit only by the operation of natural laws. The immense number of planted and cultivated trees over the great plains of Kansas and Nebraska will undoubtedly contribute their part in the coming years toward the increase of rain-fall, and, what is more important, its substantial retention in the soil, and more slow and equal distribution than was possible when the same amount of rain fell upon a hardened, open prairie, and without the intervention of loosened soil and vegetation, drained at once as torrents into the beds of the nearest water-courses." But trees restore moisture to the atmosphere in another way. During active vegetation, immense quantities of water are exhaled from the leaves. Hales' experiment with a sunflower 3½ feet high, and with a surface of 5616 square inches, showed that it perspired at the rate of about 25 ounces of water every 12 hours. This amount will vary with the warmth and dryness of the air. Hence we can see the utility of trees in dry climates to supply moisture to the atmosphere. In 1870, Von Pettenkofer communicated to the Munich Academy of Science the result of his experiments on an oak tree during its summer growth. He found that the amount of water exhaled steadily increased from May to July, and then decreased until October. The number of leaves on the tree was estimated at 751,592, and the evaporation was 539.16 centimeters of water. The rain-fall during the same period on the area covered by the tree was 65 centimeters. Hence the evaporation was 8⅓ times the rain-fall. This excess was drawn up by the roots from a considerable depth. Thus we see that trees are constantly acting pumps, which prevent the drying of a climate by restoring to the air the moisture which would otherwise be carried to the sea by streams and rivers. Removal of forests increases the amount of water carried to the sea, and decreases the amount which, returned to the atmosphere, condenses into cloud and rain. Under certain circumstances this may be good, but carried to excess the climate may become too dry for the profitable pursuit of agriculture. This action of forests of which we have been speaking is illustrated by the descriptions lately received from Stanley of the humid climate of the Aruwhimi forests. This is to be explained as suggested by H. F. Blanford, in *Nature*, by the re-precipitation of the moisture of the forest, which is carried upward by the ascending equatorial air currents.

Without considering the beneficial effects of wooded districts on the health of a community, we have sufficient reason in what has been pointed out to make us guard them jealously, and adopt measures to extend them over districts unfit for cultivation but admirably suited for the growth of trees.

ORIGIN OF PETROLEUM.

Two theories have been put forward to explain the origin of petroleum. One states that its origin is inorganic, the other that it is organic. According to the first, as defended especially by Mendelejeff, water penetrating through the surface of the earth comes in contact with carburets of iron and other metals which are highly heated. A chemical action ensues which results in the formation of oxides of the metals and hydrocarbons. The latter are condensed in the cooler parts of the earth's crust, the liquid product being our petroleum. Mendelejeff was led to this belief from the fact that petroleum occurs in some places in Tertiary, while in others it is found in the Devonian and Silurian strata. Hence, according to his theory, it was condensed in these strata as it rose from lower ones where it was formed and in which few organic remains are found. In support of this view, Mendelejeff formed in the laboratory, by reactions similar to those supposed to take place in the earth, hydrocarbons resembling petroleum.

But the weight of geological and chemical opinion is in favor of the organic origin of petroleum. Some claim that it is formed by the distillation at a very high temperature of bituminous coal, others that it is formed at ordinary temperatures by the distillation of other organic matter. The fact that the whole petroleum series may be artificially made by the distillation of coal is evidence in favor of the former view. In support of the second theory, we find fossil cavities in limestone filled with bitumen which was evidently formed by the decomposition of the organic matter. Fossil fish, too, entirely changed into bitumen have been found in many shales, notably in Scotland. Hence, the most common opinion at present is that coal and oil have been formed from organic matter, the former from plants in the presence of fresh water, the latter from plants and animals in the presence of salt-water. The frequent association of oil and salt seems to justify the assumption, that salt-water played a part in the formation of petroleum. An important contribution to the literature of this subject has been lately made by the German chemist, C. Engler, who, acting on the suggestion of Kramer & Bottger, that certain hydrocarbons found in petroleum were formed by the distillation of organic matter at a comparatively low temperature and under high pressure, performed the experiment with very happy results. He distilled one thousand pounds of menhaden oil at a temperature ranging from 350° to 400°, and under a pressure of two atmospheres. The result of the distillation was a combustible gas, water and six hundred pounds of oil resembling very closely crude petroleum. Twenty-six per cent. of this oil boiled below 150°, and by a fractional distillation of this portion he isolated pentane, hexane, heptane, octane and nonane of the paraffine series. He also found certain members of the ethene series which also occur in petroleum, thus establishing an identity between this oil and that portion of petroleum which boils below 150°. The experimenter further confirmed this result by distilling the constituents of fish oil. Engler then calculated the amount of

carbon and hydrogen that should remain in the oil on the supposition that all the oxygen of triolein and tristearin, two of the compounds distilled, combined with part of the hydrogen to form water. The calculation gives a residue of 87 per cent. of carbon and 13 per cent. of hydrogen. Here we have a very striking coincidence, since many analyses of American and European petroleums made by distinguished chemists give exactly this percentage of carbon and hydrogen in crude petroleum. Thus we have in these experiments a further confirmation of the organic origin of petroleum which geologically is universally associated with fossiliferous strata.

Book Notices.

Le Socialisme d'État et la Réforme Sociale. Par *Claudio Jannet*, Professeur d'Économie Politique, etc.; pp. xvi–544. Librairie Plon. Paris. 1889.

M. Claudio Jannet's valuable work, *Les Etats Unis Contemporains*, has made his name familiar to Americans. His latest publication, *Le Socialisme d'Etat*, will add to his well-earned reputation as a political economist, a teacher and a writer. The work is practical, sound in principle, broadly conservative, and crowded with facts illustrating the recent development of economic and social movements in Europe. Here where we have few, if any, trained Catholic professors who devote themselves wholly to the study and presentation of the social problems of the day, M. Jannet's work will be welcomed as a sound and helpful guide. Our journalists, legislators, employers—even our learned college debaters—can acquire from M. Jannet a fuller understanding of the various theories that are current to-day; of the factors that complicate the various questions at issue; of legislation that has been effected, or that is called for; of dangers that threaten the social structure; of remedies that have been suggested and tried, and of others that right reason points out.

Though we have had a costly experience of the most logical of all forms of Socialism—Anarchism—there are many optimists who try to convince themselves that Socialism is, by its nature, wholly European, and that Americans have nothing to fear from it. The optimists have not learned that Socialism is a religion as well as a political creed. It is the Protestantism of the last quarter of the 19th century— no more un-American than un-German or un-English. If we are able to defend ourselves against its inroads, our success will be owing to our acquaintance with its purposes and methods, as these have been developed in every European country. In M. Claudio Jannet's volume the reader will find a thorough exposition of the doctrines and the machinery of European Socialism; and, what is of equal importance, a full and direct answer to the Socialist claims; an answer based on the teachings of Christianity, on reason, on the principles of a sound economy, and on facts. From beginning to end, M. Jannet's book is an answer to So-

cialism, of whatever kind: Revolutionary Socialism, scientific Socialism, so-called Christian Socialism, and state Socialism. In his study, the author confines himself to no single country or period. He is a historian of the past as well as of the present.

In Germany we find the most advanced forms of "Christian," anti-Christian, and state Socialism. To Germany, therefore, M. Jannet pays especial attention. Though all countries, not excepting our own, have recently tried their hand at legislation of a character that may be called socialistic, Germany, under Prince von Bismarck's lead, has adopted measures whose radicalism is not to be mistaken. These various measures, especially the Insurance Laws, M. Jannet discusses at length; not merely sketching their details, but also considering the principles that underlie these laws, their practicability, their economic and their political bearings. His presentation and discussion are thorough, and all the more valuable on account of the opportunity M. Jannet affords the reader of comparing the German schemes with those formulated in other countries.

The modern idea of the state—especially the German idea—is that of an entity whose powers have neither beginning nor end. And yet, what is the modern State, practically? M. Leroy Beaulieu has recently given an answer which is extremely simple, and, at the same time, thoughtful. The state is "the men whom chance or the inconsistency of the elections has momentarily lifted into power." It would be hard to find reasons in defense of the absolutism of a state which answered to this definition. On the other hand, prudence would teach the people that they cannot be too watchful of their rights as against such a state. M. Jannet, who is a democrat in the right sense of the word, treats dispassionately the question of state interference in social and economic reforms, and the limits within which the state may or should act. These are matters on which it is imperative that the people should have just and exact views. The future of our Christian civilization largely depends on a solution of the social problems at the least possible sacrifice of individual liberty. The people will be secure, indeed, if they accept M. Jannet's view of government, which he well defines as neither more nor less than an administration, whose duty it is to look to the best interests of all the people.

M. Jannet is a believer in the liberty of labor—the liberty of each individual to choose his own trade or profession, to exercise it where he pleases, and to exercise it in the way he pleases—provided, always, that, under the plea of liberty, the moral law is not violated. With labor thus free, and the state keeping strictly within its limits, "not taking from one to give to another, not clogging the movements of one class in order to make those of another class more free," but "doing what it can to make the means of production easier for all," there is no economic problem that the citizens cannot solve by themselves, provided they keep well in view the teachings of Christianity. There is M. Jannet's position, and it is the only reasonable position for the intelligent Christian.

Association, combination, from these spring many of the social evils of which we complain to-day. Not because associations, combinations, are bad in themselves, but because we have not as yet accommodated ourselves to the conditions of which they are only an expression. In association M. Jannet finds a potent remedy for the very evils we suffer from. And his argument is convincing; for it is an argument whose every word is a fact—facts drawn from Germany, France, England, Belgium, Austria, Italy. Organized self-help has effected wonderful things for workers of all kinds. No code of special laws could have done for mechanics and

farmers what the admirable co-operative associations have done for them. Here we have hardly begun to appreciate the value of co-operation, and many American readers of M. Jannet's book will learn for the first time of the extended application of the principle of co-operation in Europe.

While determining the limits of state action, M. Jannet is careful to point out where the law can act advantageously, and he instances many useful laws that have been put into execution of late. In America we have not to face the problems of the Old World that are a consequence of ancient statutes providing for the transmission of real property in the family—laws based on a condition of society that no longer exists. In chapter iv. M. Jannet gives a most interesting account of the steps by which a radical reform was recently effected in the German laws of inheritance, a reform initiated by the people themselves. The notion that the people do not know what they want, and that legislators do, is too common, even in some ideal democracies. It is encouraging to see the citizens of an imperial government providing for their own welfare without passionate debates, divisions, politics, or bribery.

Neither laws nor self-help can cure all the ills of society. M. Jannet enforces this fact on his readers. There is, and always will be, a place for charity. The obligations of charity M. Jannet sets forth clearly. He does more; he shows what Christian charity has done and is doing, in Europe, to relieve the sufferings of the poor. It is a beautiful story. American Catholics will learn from M. Jannet's book that they have not yet methodized charity as have their French and German brethren. The very best minds have given themselves to a study of the wants of the poor, and to the most effective means of supplying them, not in a temporary way, but with a view to permanent benefit.

We said that M. Jannet's book was crowded with facts and discussions. In a short notice it would be impossible to do the work justice, or even to convey a fair notion of its contents. The rights and duties of employer and employed, the duties of corporations, apprenticeship, legal limitation of the hours of labor, Sunday work, monopolies, trusts, land ownership, state savings-banks, protection and free trade—every moving question of the day is handled with clearness, precision, and the largest knowledge. The book is a compendium of the recent history of European social movements. It is a work not only of detail, of research, not only a work of information, but also of deep thought; and certainly the best work of its kind that has come from Catholic hands.

The social problems of our own country will not be solved by the aid of uninformed, hasty, theoretic writers and speakers. Calm, reflective, studious, broad-minded, practical, religious men can alone help us to see our way aright. M. Claudio Jannet is one of the few who, appreciating the importance of the questions that disturb our modern society, approach them with a full mind, a large intelligence, and a generous heart. As Catholics we feel a pride in his exceptional work, which we hope may find its way into non-Catholic as well as Catholic hands.

LIVES OF THE FATHERS; OR, SKETCHES OF CHURCH HISTORY IN BIOGRAPHY. By *Frederick W. Farrar, D.D., F.R.S.* New York: Macmillan & Co. 1889.

The distinctive characteristics of Canon Farrar's writings are so well known that it seems almost needless to say that the style of this work is that of pure limpid English. The descriptions, graphic and lifelike, and the narrative in each biography flow on without a break or needless

episode to distract the reader's attention from the main subject or cause fatigue. There is not a dry or tedious paragraph from beginning to end of the two volumes which make up the work.

The object of the author, as he states it in his preface, is not to write a full and continuous history of the early Church, but "rather to connect the history of the Church during the first four centuries with the lives of her principal fathers and teachers." He is encouraged to attempt this by the fact that "though the interest which attaches to the human and personal element of biography is, to a certain extent, separable from it, yet is so closely connected with it that biography and history serve the purpose of mutual illustration, so that any one who is familiar with the lives of the chief Church writers will scarcely be ignorant of any event of capital importance which occurred during the epoch in which they lived."

The author, as a further reason for his work, says that though much has been written on the subject, yet, "apart from histories of the Church or of Christianity, there have been but few attempts since the days of Cave to write consecutively the lives of the fathers." This statement, to those who are at all acquainted with the labors in this field of Newman and many other eminent scholars in England and on the European continent, seems not only a too sweeping assertion, but one also which can only obtain acceptance with persons who are not acquainted with the writings of those learned scholars.

Canon Farrar gives a list of the numerous authors whom he has consulted, but declares that he is

"Nullius addictus jurare in verbo magistri,"

and that he has "repeatedly exercised" his "own judgment upon the original sources."

This statement is a plain and truthful declaration of the spirit in which Canon Farrar writes. He does not feel at liberty to set aside with scant courtesy the second-hand testimonies of scholars and writers who lived much nearer to the times of the early Church fathers and had means of knowing them and judging of them which now no longer exist; but, in the exercise of his own personal judgment, he rejects and ignores as of no importance, and, indeed, as the spurious productions of "the many superstitions which infected the pure faith of Christianity," facts of deepest significance which are testified to by contemporaneous writers of unquestionable credibility.

The only discoverable reason for this is that those facts contradict Canon Farrar's personal theory of the nature of the Church, the manner of its growth, and the relation of those Church fathers to the doctrine and discipline of the Church. For those fathers and teachers, personally, the author professes "the deepest respect, fully sympathizing with them in their difficulties and trials." He "acknowledges their greatness and the greatness of their services to the cause of Christianity," "even when" he thinks "it right to point out their necessary limitations," which "limitations," the author's theory, it is almost needless to say, necessarily not only dwarfs the greatness of those Church fathers, but reduces to a minimum their actual services to Christianity. For they were not only fallible men, but, according to the author's judgment, were deeply tinged with the superstitions of the age; were violent partisans, and so violent, too, in their personal prejudices and their personal likes and dislikes that wilful falsification and misrepresentation were common among them, and they were more zealous in propagating and defending the ideas

of the different schools of thought and factions to which they respectively belonged than for the growth of pure religion. They were great men, good men, but after all were products of the ages in which they lived and of their personal environments.

Canon Farrar commences his series of sketches with a biography of St. Ignatius. Of previous writers he thinks that though we have a few writings of Christian teachers, one or two of which may date back to the life-time of St. John, of their authors "we know little or nothing." To the so called "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," professedly discovered by Bishop Briennios, in 1883, he seems to attach great importance, though coming "from an unknown source." He thinks it throws "a strange and interesting light over the simple organization, faith, and worship of the early communities of Christians. In marked contrast with this, he attaches but little importance to the beautiful and suggestive letter of St. Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, the authenticity of which is indisputable, and of St. Clement personally he says we can know nothing" beyond the fact that he was "an early bishop of Rome." As for the epistle itself, he finds in it "great purity of moral tone and spirtual intuition," and "interesting glimpses of facts respecting the imprisonment of St. Paul, and the early female Christian martyrs, but characterizes it as "a mosaic of second-hand phrases and "loose quotations," and as drawing "unauthorized arguments from misquoted texts of sacred scripture."

In the biographical sketch of St. Ignatius, an account is given of his examination by the Emperor Trajan, and of the route by which he was probably taken to Rome. His epistles to the different churches to which he wrote are analyzed, particular stress being laid upon his earnest exhortations against Docetism; but what gives their chief historical value to these epistles are their references to the authority of priests and bishops over the laity, and the distinctions made between the two orders are explained by the theory that "the language of the martyr comes to us with very different *connotations* from those which correspond to its real meaning. . . . . Though we find in Ignatius the growth of the hierarchic system, yet there is in the genuine Ignatius no trace of sacerdotalism. . . . . He is not writing a scheme of theology or even of church government, but only occasional letters."

This last statement is true, but Canon Farrar seems unable to see that this very fact gives all the more importance to St. Ignatius's letters as historical evidence as to what the actual government of the Church was in that early age. He says that St. Ignatius's remarks about the authority of the bishop and the sin of disobeying him would be "simply blasphemous if they were extended into universal propositions, wholly apart from the special circumstances under which they were written. . . . . He does not speak of bishops as *instituted* by the Apostles." He nowhere represents them as *successors* of the Apostles. His bishop is a *parochial* pastor. His testimony is confined to the churches in Asia, and "he nowhere disparages other forms of church-government." . . . . "The bishop of Ignatius is not a marchical bishop, nor even a diocesan; he is a congregational bishop."

After thus showing the spirit and manner in which Canon Farrar deals with St. Clement of Rome and St. Ignatius of Antioch, it is needless, we think, to take up separately the other sketches which make up these volumes. They consist of painstaking studies of all the most distinguished fathers of the Church and their writings down to St. Chrysostom. They also comprise disquisitions on Tertullian's controversial and Montanistic writings, the influence of Origen, the dawn of Arianism,

the Council of Nice, on monasticism and asceticism, with notes on the early bishops of Rome, Alexandria and Antioch, and on the heretics of the first four centuries. These studies and sketches are learned, and the author's statements are seemingly fortified by numerous references to original historical sources. But the coloring and perspective of the pictures are such that in reality they falsify the real characteristics of the Christianity and of the Church fathers of those early ages. The practices and belief of the Christians of those ages are measured and tested by the prevalent notions of modern liberalism and rationalism. Accounts of well-attested miracles are treated as mythical stories; the high esteem in which virginity was held is characterized as one of the errors of those ages, and so, too, are other ideas and doctrines which were then plainly conspicuous in the Catholic Church as they now are, but which are denied by Protestants and rationalists. The fact, too plain to be denied, of the authority exercised by the Bishop of Rome over all other bishops and wherever Christianity had spread, is attributed to political and other like causes.

The result of this is that, taking the work as a whole, it is a series of stories, learned, minute, and life-like, about the Church fathers, as the writer in his dogmatic liberalism conceives that those fathers ought to have been, according to his personal ideas; but as biographies they are misleading, one-sided, and partial.

ELEMENTS OF ECCLESIASTICAL LAW. Vol. III. Ecclesiastical Punishments. By *Rev. S. B. Smith*, formerly Professor of Canon Law, Author of "Notes," etc. New York, St. Louis and Einsiedeln: Benziger Brothers.

"After fifteen years of ceaseless toil and unwearied study, we have at last finished these Elements of Ecclesiastical Law." So writes Father Smith in the preface to his latest work.

Fifteen years of ceaseless toil and unwearied study! It bespeaks much self-denial, many sacrifices, praiseworthy zeal. But the prize is worth it all and more. Father Smith has completed a great work. He has done his brothers of the priesthood, in the English-speaking world, a great service. He has done very much to advance on earth the interests of God and His Church. That Father Smith has written his work in English has been made the occasion of serious objection. Latin, it is true, is the language of the Church, her mother-tongue, whose study, therefore, should be fostered and stimulated in every possible way. And yet for all that, we think it good that the "Elements of Ecclesiastical Law" have been given us in the English tongue. All priests are familiar with Latin—some more, some less. But all are sufficiently conversant with the tongue to read it without much difficulty. Yet there is not a doubt but that almost all of us turn more readily to an English than to a Latin work. To say so much may not be to our credit, yet the fact is plain. Given to us in the English language, we do not hesitate to say that Father Smith's work will be read and studied by many who, were it written in Latin, would pass it by. This we hold to be a great good.

In the seminaries of this country, and, we believe, in those of other English-speaking countries, canon law has been, and largely is still, an unknown quantity. In some of the older works of theology, now no longer studied in our seminaries, it was sought, both in the general plan of these works and by some little attention to the subject of law, to supply the deficiency. But the result in no way corresponded to the intention. It is not going too far to say that of the *corpus juris* of the Church, and of the working and procedure in the application of her

laws, our students and clergy generally have been entirely ignorant. That this has been the fruitful source of many sad mistakes, much scandal, and often of great injustice, there cannot be a doubt. Wrongs have been done in the name of the Church and of justice, and by well-meaning and conscientious men, that can never in this world be righted; and which certainly never would have been done if the laws of the Church and the rights of her clergy had been understood. These considerations, and others of greater importance which suggest themselves, emphasize the necessity of a thorough knowledge of canon law on the part of the clergy generally; and now, more than ever, that we have practically a canon law for the Church in this country.

The present volume of Father Smith's work deals with ecclesiastical punishments. As the rev. author says in his preface, it is a subject which grates harshly on the ear, yet we must confess that it is one of the highest importance. He has done his work thoroughly and ably, leaving us nothing to desire.

The Church in her laws has determined the nature and variety of the penalties to be inflicted on her erring subjects. She has defined, too, as it is in her province to define, what actions are punishable, and also the specific penalty attached to each such action. For superiors she has defined most explicitly the method to be followed in imposing these penalties, and for the inferior (subject) the way in which he can protect himself against unmerited punishment.

One by one, distinctly and explicitly, the rev. author explains these several points. Proving the Church's right to inflict punishments upon her subjects, he enters into a minute description of the kinds of punishment she makes use of. The two broad general classes of punishments, he tells us, are preventive and repressive. The *preventive* are those which aim at saving the ecclesiastic already on the inclined plane of evil. The *repressive* are those which aim at bringing back the fallen to the path of duty, and obliterating the consequences of his crime. The chief *preventive* penalties are spiritual exercises, canonical warnings and precept. Reading the author's explanation of these several punishments, one cannot help being impressed by the yearning love of the Church for her clergy, to which they bear testimony. Watching them with eyes as tender and anxious as a mother's, she anticipates the dangers before them and seeks in ways the most loving to save them. With marked clearness and learned minuteness the author explains the nature of these penalties, as well as *how*, by *whom*, and *when* they may be imposed.

Having treated of these *preventive* penalties, Father Smith enters into what rightly may be considered the pre-eminently important part of his task, a description and learned explanation of the *repressive* punishments which the Church has framed and sanctioned for the correction of her erring ecclesiastics. These, he tells us, are of a duplex order—punitive and reformative. The punitive are repressive punishments in the strictest sense, having for their aim the infliction of pain or suffering, as an atonement for and expiation of the illicit pleasure derived from the law's violation. Chief among these penalties are penal transfers, removals from office, disqualification for offices and orders, and infamy. The reformative, though strictly repressive, differ from the punitive in this, that their chief aim is correctional and medicinal, and their remoter object the infliction of punishment. The principal reformative penalties are suspensions, excommunications and interdicts.

To the description and detailed explanation of these several divisions of repressive punishments the author devotes almost three hundred pages

of his work. Following him through these pages, one cannot but feel admiration, again and again, for the task he has undertaken and the manner in which he has accomplished it. Not only does he discuss the broad leading diversions, under which these penalties are classed, but in detail and with learned accuracy everything bearing directly upon the subject matter. Of especial and exceptional interest to us here in the United States is the portion of his work devoted to a consideration of the "Dismissal and Transfer of Irremovable Rectors." For he has treated the subject with a special reference to our time and country, taking into full account the latest instruction of the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda and the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore.

Very instructive and salutary is the portion of his work which treats of the mention of excommunication. Depending in the past as we generally did on the scant knowledge given us in our theologies concerning the question of excommunication, there is no chapter of the work, we are sure, to which our clergy will turn with more interest. Here we find the subject exhaustively treated, everything bearing upon it explained in the most satisfactory manner. He first gives us a correct notion of excommunication, tells us why and wherefore the Church has framed this punishment, gives us in detail the past and present discipline of the Church concerning it, as well as the effects produced by it.

We cordially recommend Dr. Smith's work. It should find a ready welcome to a place in the library. In form and manner it is all everyone could reasonably desire, written in excellent style, strong, clear, concise. We predict for it a wide circulation. With the better knowledge it will bring, we look for increased harmony and fraternal love, and a closer attachment and a closer adherence to the laws and discipline of the Church.

THE TESTIMONY OF JUSTIN MARTYR TO EARLY CHRISTIANITY. Lectures delivered on the L. P. Stone Foundation at Princeton Theological Seminary, in March, 1888. By *George T. Purves, D.D.* New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co.

The increased attention which, of late years, Protestant scholars are giving to the early Christian writers, is a subject of sincere congratulation. Until recently they almost entirely neglected them, looking upon them as of doubtful authenticity, if not positively spurious, or, even though authentic and genuine, yet at best only the productions of men who, necessarily, were in a great degree ignorant of the New Testament Scriptures, owing to the paucity of copies of its different parts, and owing also to the fact that those parts had not yet been gathered together, and, indeed, no definite conclusion had as yet been arrived at as to what writings were actually inspired and constituted the New Testament. Owing to these well-known facts, Protestants who tenaciously held the fallacious notion that the Sacred Scriptures were the only rule of faith, consistently, though erroneously, regarded the writings of Christians during the early ages of the Church as of very lttle value. For, according to their false notion of the relation of the Sacred Scriptures to Christian doctrine, they could not but look upon those early Christian writers as very imperfectly acquainted with "pure gospel doctrine." With these erroneous ideas, the only real use consistent Protestants could make of the writings of Christians who lived in times close to that of the Apostles, was to gather up their incidental quotations or paraphrases of separate texts of the Evangelists, of the Acts of the Apostles and their Epistles, and show by them that those inspired writings were extant at those times, and were not the productions of subsequent ages.

But the fact that those who were orally taught by the Apostles themselves, or by their immediate pupils and disciples, must, of necessity, have been well acquainted with Apostolic doctrine, is too significant to be entirely ignored by the more thoughtful of Protestants, however tenaciously they strive to hold to the notion that "the Bible is the only rule of faith." It becomes thus a subject of interest to learn what the Christian of the early ages did really believe, and in investigating this they are confronted with the fact that their belief was substantially that of Catholics of the present day.

In endeavoring to escape the force of this, to them, awkward fact, Protestants commonly resort to one or the other of two methods. The first of these methods is to deny the fact altogether, and to try to give plausibility to their denial by arranging selected passages from early Christian writers in such a way as that their real meaning is obscured, or made to seem just the opposite of what it actually is. The other is to acknowledge the sincerity and piety of the early Christian writers, but to insist that they were infected with heathen or Judæistic notions they had not gotten rid of, or with the errors and superstition which, even in those ages, had commenced corrupting the Christian faith.

The author of the work before us employs both methods. From the very outset of his disquisitions he examines St. Justin's writings from a false point of view. He starts with the notion that the Church, when first established, had no external or other unity except "a moral and spiritual unity." After a time, and by a gradual natural process, "the conflicts of Christianity united the scattered communities of believers into what was practically an external association," yet they "were only united by a common faith and order, a common danger and hope." "The *idea* of the universal Church as a visible society with a definite creed and a prescribed organization was predominating" even at that early time, and the author thinks that "it is important to ask how this state of things was brought about."

It is not surprising that, studying St. Justin's writings with a mind thus preoccupied with erroneous notions of the Church's unity and kindred subjects, the author of the work before us fails to perceive the true meaning and force of the testimonies of that distinguished early Christian Apologist. The references St. Justin makes to the functions and authority of priests and bishops are attributed to his being infected with a spirit of "sacerdotalism" and "ecclesiasticism," his reference to the necessity of good works to "a tendency to Christian *legalism* characteristic of his time." His allusions to "regeneration by baptism" that "in the Eucharist the food over which thanks has been rendered . . . . is the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh"—these and other testimonies of St. Justin to Catholic doctrine are alleged to be instances how St. Justin "curiously combined with his rationalism a tendency towards a mechanical view of the Sacraments."

The writer has evidently given to his examination of St. Justin's writings much time and study, but, unfortunately, they have been productive of little good, owing to the erroneous manner in which they were employed.

HENRY VIII. AND THE ENGLISH MONASTERIES. An attempt to illustrate the History of their Suppression. By *Francis Aidan Gasquet*, Monk of the Order of St. Benedict, sometime Prior of St Gregory's Monastery, Dawnside, Bath. Vol. II. London: John Hodges. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. 1889.

ON receipt of the first volume of this work, we reviewed it at some length, and gave our opinion of its great value, as being made up mainly

of extracts from official documents and letters of Henry VIII. and his chief instruments and tools in suppressing the monasteries of England. The second volume, now before us, confirms what we then said. It shows how Henry VIII. persisted in his scheme of suppressing the English monasteries and appropriated to himself their treasures and revenues. The story is told and the proofs confirming it are given, mainly by extracts from the letters of Henry VIII. and his chief instruments in the work of spoliation, or from other documents heretofore guarded rigidly, but that are now allowed to be examined and copied. The deceit, the treachery and cupidity and utter heartlessness of Henry's character are brought clearly to light from his own letters suggesting to his tools the methods they should employ and the false charges they should concoct against the monks and nuns. But as Henry had necessarily to employ unprincipled persons to carry out his designs, they did not fail to avail themselves of every opportunity to cheat their royal master as well as to rob the monasteries. The sickening story of wanton waste, pilfering, pillage and mock auctions, worse than plain pilfering, is told in the words of the letters and other documents preserved in the English archives. For, as commonly happens in such cases, some of the plunderers exposed the misdeeds of the others.

The work of suppressing the lesser monasteries was first carried into effect by proceedings under Act of Parliament. But, as some escaped through their not falling within the limits of the Act and other causes, the process was adopted of dissolving these and seizing their property and revenues by attainder of their abbots and priors on false charges of complicity with popular uprisings against the ruthless proceedings of Henry's unprincipled commissioners. The heads of the monasteries were mostly put to death, and the monks turned out of their houses to starve or live as best they could. The houses themselves were stripped of everything that could be turned into money, and then destroyed.

The history of the suppression of the convents is also described and the hardships to which the disbanded and expelled nuns were subjected. The treatment of the friars and the proceedings against the three Benedictine Abbots of Glastonbury, Reading and Colchester, and their execution, form two of the blackest chapters in this black history of ruthless spoliation, robbery and murder.

In separate chapters the rising of the people against Henry's tyrannical proceedings, the "Pilgrimage of Grace," and the second northern rising are described. In other chapters details are given of the spoils of the monasteries, and the amounts realized from them, the destruction of books and manuscripts, of works of art and of sacred relics; of the manner in which the spoils were spent or squandered, and the results of the suppression.

In his modest brief prefatory letter to his readers the author says that "the mass of records ready to hand are all instructive and would furnish materials for special monographs on many subjects of deep and present interest." It is to be hoped that he or some one else of like ability, diligence, and carefulness, will avail themselves of the opportunity thus afforded for giving us the true history of the various acts of Henry VIII. and his daughter Elizabeth, from authentic official documents.

A Manual of Prayers for the Use of the Catholic Laity. Prepared and published by order of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co.

We have certainly had no stint of prayer-books before the appearance

of this one; but had there not been room for another it is certain that the Fathers of the Third Plenary Council would not have ordered one to be prepared and published. It was partly because of this very plentifulness that such action was taken for many editions, with all kinds of titles, have been put upon the market, some of them even without episcopal approbation, some still bearing the *imprimatur* of bishops long since dead, and some even, sad to say, appearing with a supposed approval which they had not received. A great many even of the old editions were exact reprints of foreign books that contained matter not suitable for this country, and ignoring matter that should be found in every American prayer-book. Besides, in most cases, the ruling of the authorities in Rome regarding the printing of portions of the Mass and other parts of the liturgy in Latin was not complied with; and several publishers, in their eagerness to outdo rivals, inserted much matter that should have no place in a prayer-book, as having no reference to any service or function in the Church, but belonging rather to a work of pious reading or instruction. Many prayer-books were thus made far too bulky for general use.

It was with a view to correcting these abuses that the manual before us was ordered to be prepared; and the priest to whom the work was entrusted has performed his duty faithfully and well. Having, in the first place, used nothing that was of doubtful authority and utility, he then submitted proof-sheets of his work to the inspection of all the bishops of the country, and their views on every point he has strictly complied with. Thus, in having the *imprimatur* of His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons, the Primate of the United States, and of Archbishop Corrigan, the prelate of the diocese in which the work is published, it has practically the approval of the whole American hierarchy.

Beginning with an illustrated calendar of feasts celebrated in the United States, which is followed by an abridgment of Christian doctrine, it contains, not only various forms of morning and evening prayers, the devotions at Mass, instructions for Confession and Communion, the Way of the Cross, the Rosary and the Scapular, as well as on the sacraments, devotions for the sick and dying, etc., but also the Ordinary and Canon of the Mass, the Vesper service (followed by a directory for finding the psalms and hymns appointed to be sung on Sundays and principal festivals of the Christian year), Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, the blessing of candles, ashes, children, and rosaries, the forms of the sacraments of Baptism, Confirmation, Matrimony and Extreme Unction, the churching of women, the recommendation of a departing soul, the marriage service and nuptial Mass, the burial service and office and Mass for the dead, the hymns and sequences for the Church's seasons, etc., in both Latin and English; and not only the Epistles and Gospels for Sundays and feast days, but also the Introits, Collects and Post-Communions. And especially should every American Catholic be pleased to find in this volume (at page 56) the "Prayer for the Church, the Civil Authorities, etc.," composed by Bishop Carroll in the year 1800, so long omitted, for some unaccountable reason, from all our prayer-books.

The mechanical part of the work deserves a special commendation; for the typography is absolutely accurate throughout, the letter-press neat and clear, and the paper of the finest quality. In every respect, indeed, this prayer-book deserves to be ranked as a standard work.

PAPERS OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY. Volume I. Report and Papers of the First Annual Meeting, held in the City of Washington, December 28, 1888. Edited by *Rev. Samuel Macauley Jackson*, M.A., Secretary. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1889.

The history of the Church is the history of the progress towards fulfilment of the mission which Christ gave to His Apostles in all ages when about to ascend into heaven. It is the history of the propagation of the faith, of the declaration, definition and manifestation of it by the Church, of the Church's conflicts with error, with her own wilful, disobedient and contumacious members on the one hand, and with the world, its false philosophy, its delusive conclusions of imperfect and superficial so-called science, its cupidity, pride, self-will, ambition, lust, and with those who were influenced by these misleading and corrupting passions, on the other hand. Hence it is evident that Church history is the most important of departments of history, and that its study, when prosecuted sincerely and honestly and with a mind free from prejudice, is productive of richest results.

Therefore we regard as one of the encouraging signs of the times the increasing disposition of late years manifested by Protestant scholars to study Church history from original sources, instead of relying for their knowledge of it upon the one-sided and intentionally misleading representations of it by former partisan Protestant writers. For the more diligently and thoroughly they examine the original documents and writings and other extant monuments, which form the sources of the history of the Church in past ages, the more plainly they will be confronted with evidence that Protestantism is irreconcilably opposed to the faith and practice of Christians not only in mediæval times, but in all ages, including that of the Apostles themselves.

It is true that there is no limit to the false conclusions which even learned scholars may deduce from their investigations of the history of the Church, when they approach the study of it with pre-existing prejudices which they fail to conquer and dismiss, or with a determined purpose to gather from it facts to support previously formed theories. Yet notwithstanding this, truth is mighty and glimpses of it will force themselves into even the most prejudiced minds, and gradually makes its influence felt.

This is plainly shown by an examination of the different papers of which the volume before us is composed. Their evident purpose is to find material for defending Protestantism and arraigning the Catholic Church. Yet, though this is their aim, the manner in which they endeavor to accomplish it is of itself an acknowledgment of the falsity of the methods heretofore pursued by Protestant historical writers, and that grounds on which they attempted to defend Protestantism were untenable. For until recently the line of defense of Protestantism and of assault upon the Catholic Church started with the assumption that the Church remained pure for three or four centuries and then became corrupt. But according to the tenor of the papers in these volumes which touch upon the early ages of Christianity, the same doctrines and practices which Protestants allege to be most mischievious and pernicious corruptions on the part of Catholics in mediæval and modern times, were held by Christians in the ages immediately succeeding that of the Apostles. Thus the writers overthrow one of the fundamental notions of Protestantism and are confronted with the fact that all Christian antiquity opposes them.

The papers in the volume before us referring to ancient Christian times illustrate and confirm what we have said. Those that treat of

"Toleration" and the Spanish Inquisition are fair examples of skilful suppression of some facts and skilful arrangement of others in order to conceal the real truth.

CHURCH HISTORY. By *Professor Kurtz*. Authorized translation from the latest revised edition by the Rev. John Macpherson, M. A. In three volumes. Vol. I. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 1889.

Though a thorough work of its kind, and a standard among a certain class of Protestants, yet this history is not one to be recommended to every Catholic reader or even student. From the Catholic standpoint, which we must insist upon as the true one, its basis and plan are erroneous—for it has a set plan, is, in fact, written with the view of establishing a thesis, and is therefore, like Bancroft's "United States," at least as much a work of controversy as of history. The author seems to regard the Church from the branch-theory point of view, as may be judged from the following extract from his introduction, in which there is a good deal of Protestant cant that sounds harsh and offensive to the Catholic ear:

"The Christian Church is to be defined as the one, many-branched communion, consisting of all those who confess that Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ who in the fulness in time appeared as the Saviour of the world. It is the Church's special task to render the saving work of Christ increasingly fruitful for all nations and individuals, under all the varying conditions of life and stages of culture. It is the task of Church History to describe the course of development through which the Church as a whole, as well as its special departments and various institutions, has passed from the time of its foundation down to our own day; to show what have been the Church's advances and retrogressions, how it has been furthered and hindered; and to tell the story of its deterioration and renewal."

There are statements here that no genuine Christian can accept, as being in conflict with Christ's promise that He would be with His Church "all days, even to the consummation of the world," and that "the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it." Indeed, this view has been taken with the apparent object of establishing a necessity for the religious revolution of the sixteenth century; but as the present volume brings the narrative down only to the early Middle Ages, we are not at present in a position to find out how far he attempts to justify this revolution.

From the very beginning of the work, however, there is no lack of erroneous and unsound views. We find nothing to show that the author believes in the divinity of Christ, and in his effort to overthrow the claim of St. Peter's Roman episcopate he conveniently ignores all the recent writings sustaining and proving it. Occasionally, on other points, he quotes Catholic authorities, but not when their views are at variance with his preconceptions. Thus he repeats hackneyed statements of rationalists concerning the Church of the Apostles and of Calvinists on the original position of the Episcopate and the Presbyterate. Once we become acquainted with these points, we need not expect to be pleased with what he has to tell us of heresies, the monastic life and the developments of canon law. The book, therefore, is a good one for ordinary readers to avoid.

But it is not without its use to Catholics. They should have one of their own of similar scope and size in the English language. This want has not yet, properly speaking, been supplied, though we have some good works; but they are either too epitomized, too diffuse, or too learned,

in the sense that they do not popularize the learning that was requisite for compiling them. We are anxious to see in our own tongue such a work, for instance, as an adaptation of Cardinal Hergenröther's "Church History." As things are now, Catholic scholars are in nearly all cases compelled to have recourse to works in foreign languages.

LEAVES FROM THE ANNALS OF THE SISTERS OF MERCY. In four volumes. Volume III., containing sketches of the Order in Newfoundland and the United States. By a Member of the Order of Mercy. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co. 1889.

The zealous and painstaking author of this book is now engaged in working up the material for the fourth volume, which that she may live to finish should be the earnest prayer of every lover of Catholic historical literature. This third instalment is most delightful reading, combining all the interest of a classical romance with the accuracy of a scientific treatise. It is certainly a most valuable addition to the history of the Church in this country.

By far the greater part of the book is devoted to the establishment and growth of the Order of Mercy in the United States, only a short portion treating of Newfoundland, of whose early ecclesiastical history a brief summary is given. Then we have an account of the call to the United States, in which Pennsylvanians especially should take the greatest interest, as it was a call made by a former Philadelphia priest and the first Bishop of the see of Pittsburgh, Rt. Rev. Michael O'Connor, D.D., to whose memory and to whose brother, the present Bishop of Omaha, the volume is dedicated. Incidentally the author gives almost a full history of the early days of the Church in the Pittsburgh diocese, in which the Sisters of Mercy have, from their first establishment there, been a very important factor. Details of their work in other sections are also dwelt upon lovingly, in New York, Chicago, and many other places, on the battlefield during our civil war, and among Chinese and Indians. There are many instances here narrated of the hardships that had to be endured, not merely against poverty, pestilence and other such ills, but against the far more deplorable evil of a rabid bigotry, which even yet has not ceased to break out occasionally, only, however, to show the supernatural character of the agency that supports such works as those in which the Sisters of Mercy are engaged.

OLD ENGLISH CATHOLIC MISSIONS. By *John Orlebar Payne, M.A.* London: Burns & Oates. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. 1889.

We have already had occasion to remark, *appropos* of a former work of Mr. Payne's, of the great awakening of interest in historical matters that has taken place recently both in England and in this country.

We do not wonder at the difficulties encountered by the compiler of this work; but we have good reason to wonder at the rich results of his investigations and researches; for we can realize what an amount of persevering industry was required to unearth and arrange such precious information as he gives. Similar work is in progress for this country, and is being done, if more slowly, at least more thoroughly. We have not such a wide field, historically, if geographically, to work upon as is the England of the era of the penal laws, the records that were kept of Catholics in the British colonies being few and circumscribed; but there is a fair promise that every shred of historical information in existence will in time be placed within reach of every reader. Such a work has long been in progress for Canada, which is exceptionally rich in original historical documents.

MORAL PHILOSOPHY; OR, ETHICS AND NATURAL LAW. By *Rev. John Rickaby*, S. J. Second edition. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1889.

Though the third in the order of reading of the Stonyhurst series of Manuals of Catholic Philosophy, the first edition of this volume was the first to appear. It is a worthy companion to the two volumes that have already been noticed in these pages, possessing all their excellences of style and arrangement of subject matter, which in this case, as Father Rickaby well remarks, "is also a study especially valued by the Catholic Church, the great Guardian of morals, and Teacher of nations. It is a field on which the Society of Jesus has labored, 'through evil report and good report.'" The book is divided into two main sections, the first giving a clear and methodical exposition of Ethics, and the second of Natural Law. From recent events and developments in our country, it is clear that the contents of both sections cannot be mastered too soon by every well-meaning citizen, as there is an alarmingly widespread disregard of the principles of both public and private morals.

AN EXPLANATION OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. Prepared for use in Catholic Schools, Academies and Colleges. By *Francis T. Furey, A. M.* New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co. 1889.

We have been favored with advance sheets of this new work, which is intended to fill a gap that has hitherto existed in the file of Catholic school books. The treatment is by way of question and answer, the former being direct and the latter brief. Not only are all the articles, sections and clauses of the Constitution and its amendments treated in detail, but there are introductory chapters on government in general and its various forms, and a supplement on State and municipal governments. There are also in the volume a review of the Articles of Confederation that preceded our present Constitution, and a historical retrospect explaining the causes that led to both. Particular stress is laid upon the reasons why Catholics should particularly admire American institutions as they now exist. We hope to see this new book adopted generally in Catholic educational establishments.

THE POPE AND IRELAND. Containing newly discovered historical facts concerning the Forged Bulls attributed to Popes Adrian IV. and Alexander III., together with a sketch of the union existing between the Catholic Church and Ireland from the Twelfth to the Nineteenth century. By *Stephen J. McCormick*, Editor of the San Francisco "Monitor." San Francisco, California: A. Waldteufel. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1889.

This book is for the most part a reprint of one side of a newspaper controversy, and as such might have been remodelled with advantage before being put in this permanent form. There is here too much reference to the opponent. But with this reservation, we have nothing but praise to bestow on Mr. McCormick's labors. He has in a most painstaking manner collected all the evidence regarding the point in controversy and made the best use of it. His work, too, is the first successful effort to cover the whole subject and to put all the available material in a permanent form and within the easily accessible reach of all. For this service alone he has laid all Catholics under a lasting obligation to him.

CONSTITUTIONES CATHOLICÆ UNIVERSITATIS AMERICÆ A SANCTA LEDE APPROBATÆ, CUM DOCUMENTIS ANNEXIS. ROMÆ: Ex Typographia Polyglotta S. C. de Propaganda Fide. MDCCCLXXXIX.

This handsome volume contains the Latin text of the documents pertaining to the establishment of our new University at Washington,

namely, the Apostolic Letters of the Holy Father dated April 10, 1887, and March 7, 1889; the Rescript of the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda of March 23, 1889; the letters of the trustees of the University and of certain archbishops to the Holy Father, and to the Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda, of October 25, 1886; letters from the same to His Holiness and to the Prefect of Propaganda of November 13, 1888; the General Constitutions of the University and those of the Theological Faculty. In these documents it is clearly set forth how the government of the new institution is provided for.

THE RELIGIOUS STATE. Together with a short treatise on the vocation to the Priesthood. Translated from the Italian of St. Alphonsus de Liguori. Edited by *Rev. Eugene Grimm, C.SS.R.* New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1889.

In this little volume, issued separately from the handsome centenary edition of the works of St. Alphonsus, are briefly and clearly set forth, first, the requisite for a vocation to the religious state, and, second, considerations for those who are called to such a condition of life. At the end of the volume there is a special treatment of the vocation to the priesthood. The book should be studied by every person contemplating a life in the religious state.

ST. BASIL'S HYMNAL. Containing music for Vespers of all the Sundays and Festivals of the year, three Masses, and over two hundred Hymns, together with Litanies, Daily Prayers, Prayers at Mass, Preparation and Prayers for Confession and Communion, and the Office and Rules for Sodalities of the Blessed Virgin Mary. Compiled from approved sources. Permissu Superiorum. Published at St. Michael's College, Toronto. 1889.

The only reason why its first title is given to this book seems to be that it is published by the Basilian Fathers. It is a useful, convenient and cheap manual for general use, and has been prepared with care and judgment. We are glad to notice that it is provided with a full alphabetical index.

LECTURES ON ENGLISH LITERATURE. By *Maurice Francis Egan*, LL.D. New York: William H. Sadler.

We have collected here a series of addresses made before young ladies of St. Mary's Academy, Notre Dame, Ind., by the Professor of English literature in Notre Dame University. They are, as is naturally to be expected from the occasion calling them forth, rather pleasant chats than profound studies. Considering that they are detached also as to subject, and not a continuous treatise, the title is somewhat misleading.

THE SACRED HEART LIBRARY. A quarterly series of standard theological works. No. 1: The Apostleship of Prayer. By *Father Henry Romière*, S.J. A new Translation, with notes, reference analyses, and index. First part (complete in one number). Philadelphia: Rev. R. S. Dewey, S.J., Publisher (office of the "Messenger of the Sacred Heart"). 1889.

Father Dewey has in this work entered upon an enterprise that deserves to meet with great success. There is no need of a commendation from

us of Father Romière's great work, of which this version by Father Dewey is eminently worthy. It is handsomely printed in a handy form, and sold at a price that places it within everybody's reach.

GOLDEN WORDS; OR, MAXIMS OF THE CROSS. Translated and adapted from the Latin of Thomas à Kempis. By *F. H. Hamilton*, M.A. Fourth edition. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. 1889.

In recommending this little work we need only quote Cardinal Newman, who qualifies it as "a beautiful little book, beautiful within and beautiful in its appearance," and Canon Oakely, who vouches for it as deserving to be in the hands of all Catholics.

THE HOLY MASS. The Sacrifice of Jesus Christ. The Ceremonies of the Mass. Preparation and Thanksgiving. The Mass and the Office that are hurriedly said. By *St. Alphonsus de Liguori*, Doctor of the Church. Edited by Rev. Eugene Grimm, C.SS.R. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1889.

This is the thirteenth volume of the uniform duodecimo centenary edition of St. Alphonsus' complete works. Its character and contents are sufficiently indicated by the full title given. We think it one of the most interesting and useful of the volumes thus far issued.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

THE ST. GERTRUDE MANUAL; OR, SPIRIT OF DEVOTION. Selected for the most part from the Revelations of Sts. Gertrude and Mechtildis. Containing also a very useful and consoling instruction on Prayer; on the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass; on Holy Communion; also a Preparation for Death. Second revised edition. Fr. Pustet & Co.: New York and Cincinnati. 1889.

THE ROMAN HYMNAL. A complete Manual of English Hymns and Latin Chants for the use of congregations, schools, colleges and choirs. Compiled and arranged by *Rev. J. B. Young*, S.J., choir-master of St. Francis Xavier's Church. New York. Fifth edition. New York and Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet & Co.

CAMPION: A Tragedy, in a Prologue and Four Acts. By The *Reverend G. Longhaye*, S.J. Translated into English blank verse by James Gillow Morgan. London: Burns & Oates. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co. 1889.

THE CASTLE AND THE MANOR; OR, MY HERO AND HIS FRIENDS. A story. By *M. A. De Winter*, of Rome. London: Burns & Oates. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co.

CORRECTIONS.—Two errors occur in the article by Rev. W. A. Fletcher in the issue of last April. On page 358, towards the end of the second paragraph, the word "unified" should be substituted for "verified;" and on page 363, in the second member of the sentence beginning, "Therefore practical reason," the text should read, "and if morality be *subjective*," etc., not "objective."

[70747]

ERIODICAL

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM